

Gradual Type Theory(Extended Version)

MAX S. NEW, Northeastern University

DANIEL R. LICATA, Wesleyan University

AMAL AHMED, Northeastern University and Inria Paris

Gradually typed languages are designed to support both dynamically typed and statically typed programming styles while preserving the benefits of each. While existing gradual type soundness theorems for these languages aim to show that type-based reasoning is preserved when moving from the fully static setting to a gradual one, these theorems do not imply that correctness of type-based refactorings and optimizations is preserved. Establishing correctness of program transformations is technically difficult, because it requires reasoning about program equivalence, and is often neglected in the metatheory of gradual languages.

In this paper, we propose an *axiomatic* account of program equivalence in a gradual cast calculus, which we formalize in a logic we call *gradual type theory* (GTT). Based on Levy’s call-by-push-value, GTT gives an axiomatic account of both call-by-value and call-by-name gradual languages. Based on our axiomatic account we prove many theorems that justify optimizations and refactorings in gradually typed languages. For example, *uniqueness principles* for gradual type connectives show that if the $\beta\eta$ laws hold for a connective, then casts between that connective must be equivalent to the so-called “lazy” cast semantics. Contrapositively, this shows that “eager” cast semantics violates the extensionality of function types. As another example, we show that gradual upcasts are pure functions and, dually, gradual downcasts are strict functions. We show the consistency and applicability of our axiomatic theory by proving that a contract-based implementation using the lazy cast semantics gives a logical relations model of our type theory, where equivalence in GTT implies contextual equivalence of the programs. Since GTT also axiomatizes the dynamic gradual guarantee, our model also establishes this central theorem of gradual typing. The model is parametrized by the implementation of the dynamic types, and so gives a family of implementations that validate type-based optimization and the gradual guarantee.

CCS Concepts: • **Theory of computation** → **Axiomatic semantics**; • **Software and its engineering** → **Functional languages**;

Additional Key Words and Phrases: gradual typing, graduality, call-by-push-value

Authors’ addresses: Max S. New, Northeastern University, maxnew@ccs.neu.edu; Daniel R. Licata, Wesleyan University, dlicata@wesleyan.edu; Amal Ahmed, Northeastern University and Inria Paris, amal@ccs.neu.edu.

2019. 2475-1421/2019/1-ART15

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3290328>

ACM Reference Format:

Max S. New, Daniel R. Licata, and Amal Ahmed. 2019. Gradual Type Theory(Extended Version). *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 3, POPL, Article 15 (January 2019), 139 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290328>

1 INTRODUCTION

Gradually typed languages are designed to support a mix of dynamically typed and statically typed programming styles and preserve the benefits of each. Dynamically typed code can be written without conforming to a syntactic type discipline, so the programmer can always run their program interactively with minimal work. On the other hand, statically typed code provides mathematically sound reasoning principles that justify type-based refactorings, enable compiler optimizations, and underlie formal software verification. The difficulty is accommodating both of these styles and their benefits simultaneously: allowing the dynamic and static code to interact without forcing the dynamic code to be statically checked or violating the correctness of type-based reasoning.

The linchpin to the design of a gradually typed language is the semantics of *runtime type casts*. These are runtime checks that ensure that typed reasoning principles are valid by checking types of dynamically typed code at the boundary between static and dynamic typing. For instance, when a statically typed function $f : \text{Num} \rightarrow \text{Num}$ is applied to a dynamically typed argument $x : ?$, the language runtime must check if x is a number, and otherwise raise a dynamic type error. A programmer familiar with dynamically typed programming might object that this is overly strong: for instance if f is just a constant function $f = \lambda x : \text{Num}.0$ then why bother checking if x is a number since the body of the program does not seem to depend on it? The reason the value is rejected is because the annotation $x : \text{Num}$ should introduce an assumption that that the programmer, compiler and automated tools can rely on for behavioral reasoning in the body of the function. For instance, if the variable x is guaranteed to only be instantiated with numbers, then the programmer is free to replace 0 with $x - x$ or vice-versa. However, if x can be instantiated with a closure, then $x - x$ will raise a runtime type error while 0 will succeed, violating the programmers intuition about the correctness of refactorings. We can formalize such relationships by *observational equivalence* of programs: the two closures $\lambda x : \text{Num}.0$ and $\lambda x : \text{Num}.x - x$ are indistinguishable to any other program in the language. This is precisely the difference between gradual typing and so-called *optional* typing: in an optionally typed language (Hack, TypeScript, Flow), annotations are checked for consistency but are unreliable to the user, so provide no leverage for reasoning. In a gradually typed language, type annotations should relieve the programmer of the burden of reasoning about incorrect inputs, as long as we are willing to accept that the program as a whole may crash, which is already a possibility in many *effective* statically typed languages.

However, the dichotomy between gradual and optional typing is not as firm as one might like. There have been many different proposed semantics of run-time type checking: “transient” cast semantics [Vitousek et al. 2017] only checks the head connective of a type (number, function, list, ...), “eager” cast semantics [Herman et al. 2010] checks run-time type information on closures, whereas “lazy” cast semantics [Findler and Felleisen 2002] will always delay a type-check on a function until it is called (and there are other possibilities, see e.g. [Siek et al. 2009; Greenberg 2015]). The extent to which these different semantics have been shown to validate type-based reasoning has been limited to syntactic type soundness and blame soundness theorems. In their strongest form, these theorems say “If t is a closed program of type A then it diverges, or reduces to a runtime error blaming dynamically typed code, or reduces to a value that satisfies A to a certain extent.” However, the theorem at this level of generality is quite weak, and justifies almost no program equivalences without more information. Saying that a resulting value satisfies type A might be a strong statement, but in transient semantics constrains only the head connective. The blame soundness theorem might also be quite strong, but depends on the definition of blame, which is part of the operational semantics of the language being defined. We argue that these type soundness theorems are only indirectly expressing the actual desired properties of the gradual language, which are *program equivalences in the typed portion of the code* that are not valid in the dynamically typed portion.

Such program equivalences typically include β -like principles, which arise from computation steps, as well as η *equalities*, which express the uniqueness or universality of certain constructions. The η law of the untyped λ -calculus, which states that any λ -term $M \equiv \lambda x.Mx$, is restricted in a typed language to only hold for terms of function type $M : A \rightarrow B$ (λ is the unique/universal way of making an element of the function type). This famously “fails” to hold in call-by-value languages in the presence of effects: if M is a program that prints “hello” before returning a function, then M will print *now*, whereas $\lambda x.Mx$ will only print when given an argument. But this can be accommodated with one further modification: the η law is valid in simple call-by-value languages¹ (e.g. SML) if we have a “value restriction” $V \equiv \lambda x.Vx$. This illustrates that η /extensionality rules must be stated for each type connective, and be sensitive to the effects/evaluation order of the terms involved. For instance, the η principle for the boolean type `Bool` in *call-by-value* is that for any term M with a free variable $x : \text{Bool}$, M is equivalent to a term that performs an if statement on x : $M \equiv \text{if } x(M[\text{true}/x])(M[\text{false}/x])$. If we have an if form that is strongly typed (i.e., errors on non-booleans) then this tells us that it is *safe* to run an if statement on any input of boolean type (in CBN, by contrast an if

¹This does not hold in languages with some intensional feature of functions such as reference equality. We discuss the applicability of our main results more generally in Section 7.

statement forces a thunk and so is not necessarily safe). In addition, even if our if statement does some kind of coercion, this tells us that the term M only cares about whether x is “truthy” or “falsy” and so a client is free to change e.g. one truthy value to a different one without changing behavior. This η principle justifies a number of program optimizations, such as dead-code and common subexpression elimination, and hoisting an if statement outside of the body of a function if it is well-scoped ($\lambda x. \text{if } y \ M \ N \equiv \text{if } y \ (\lambda x. M) \ (\lambda x. N)$). Any eager datatype, one whose elimination form is given by pattern matching such as 0 , $+$, 1 , \times , `list`, has a similar η principle which enables similar reasoning, such as proofs by induction. The η principles for lazy types *in call-by-name* support dual behavioral reasoning about lazy functions, records, and streams.

An Axiomatic Approach to Gradual Typing. In this paper, we systematically study questions of program equivalence for a class of gradually typed languages by working in an *axiomatic theory* of gradual program equivalence, a language and logic we call *gradual type theory* (GTT). Gradual type theory is the combination of a language of terms and gradual types with a simple logic for proving program equivalence and *error approximation* (equivalence up to one program erroring when the other does not) results. The logic axiomatizes the equational properties gradual programs should satisfy, and offers a high-level syntax for proving theorems about many languages at once: if a language models gradual type theory, then it satisfies all provable equivalences/approximations. Due to its type-theoretic design, different axioms of program equivalence are easily added or removed. Gradual type theory can be used both to explore language design questions and to verify behavioral properties of specific programs, such as correctness of optimizations and refactorings.

To get off the ground, we take two properties of the gradual language for granted. First, we assume a compositionality property: that any cast from A to B can be factored through the dynamic type $?$, i.e., the cast $\langle B \Leftarrow A \rangle t$ is equivalent to first casting up from A to $?$ and then down to B : $\langle B \Leftarrow ? \rangle \langle ? \Leftarrow A \rangle t$. These casts often have quite different performance characteristics, but should have the same extensional behavior: of the cast semantics presented in Siek et al. [2009], only the partially eager detection strategy violates this principle, and this strategy is not common. The second property we take for granted is that the language satisfies the *dynamic gradual guarantee* [Siek et al. 2015a] (“graduality”)—a strong correctness theorem of gradual typing— which constrains how changing type annotations changes behavior. Graduality says that if we change the types in a program to be “more precise”—e.g., by changing from the dynamic type to a more precise type such as integers or functions—the program will either produce the same behavior as the original or raise a dynamic type error. Conversely, if a program does not error and some types are made “less precise” then behavior does not change.

We then study what program equivalences are provable in GTT under various assumptions. Our central application is to study when the β, η equalities are satisfied in a gradually typed language. We approach this problem by a surprising tack: rather than defining the behavior of dynamic type casts and then verifying or invalidating the β and η equalities, we *assume* the language satisfies β and η equality and then show that certain reductions of casts are in fact program equivalence *theorems* deducible from the axioms of GTT.

The cast reductions that we show satisfy all three constraints are those given by the “lazy cast semantics” [Findler and Felleisen 2002; Siek et al. 2009]. As a contrapositive, any gradually typed language for which these reductions are not program equivalences is *not* a model of the axioms of gradual type theory. This mean the language violates either compositionality, the gradual guarantee, or one of the β, η axioms—and in practice, it is usually η .

For instance, a transient semantics, where only the top-level connectives are checked, violates η for strict pairs

$$x : A_1 \times A_2 \vdash (\text{let } (x_1, x_2) = x; 0) \neq 0$$

because the top-level connectives of A_1 and A_2 are only checked when the pattern match is introduced. As a concrete counterexample to contextual equivalence, let A_1, A_2 all be `String`. Because only the top-level connective is checked, $(0, 1)$ is a valid value of type `String` \times `String`, but pattern matching on the pair ensures that the two components are checked to be strings, so the left-hand side `let (x1, x2) = (0, 1); 0` $\mapsto \text{U}$ (raises a type error). On the right-hand side, with no pattern, match a value (0) is returned. This means simple program changes that are valid in a typed language, such as changing a function of two arguments to take a single pair of those arguments, are invalidated by the transient semantics. In summary, transient semantics is “lazier” than the types dictate, catching errors only when the term is inspected.

As a subtler example, in call-by-value “eager cast semantics” the $\beta\eta$ principles for all of the eager datatypes $(0, +, 1, \times, \text{lists, etc.})$ will be satisfied, but the η principle for the function type \rightarrow is violated: there are values $V : A \rightarrow A'$ for which $V \neq \lambda x : A. Vx$. For instance, take an arbitrary function value $V : A \rightarrow \text{String}$ for some type A , and let $V' = \langle A \rightarrow ? \Leftarrow A \rightarrow \text{String} \rangle V$ be the result of casting it to have a dynamically typed output. Then in eager semantics, the following programs are not equivalent:

$$\lambda x : A. V'x \neq V' : A \rightarrow ?$$

We cannot observe any difference between these two programs by applying them to arguments, however, they are distinguished from each other by their behavior when *cast*. Specifically, if we cast both sides to $A \rightarrow \text{Number}$, then $\langle A \rightarrow \text{Number} \Leftarrow A \rightarrow ? \rangle (\lambda x : A. V'x)$ is a value, but $\langle A \rightarrow \text{Number} \Leftarrow A \rightarrow ? \rangle V'$ reduces to an error because `Number` is incompatible with `String`. However this type error might not

correspond to any actual typing violation of the program involved. For one thing, the resulting function might never be executed. Furthermore, in the presence of effects, it may be that the original function $V : A \rightarrow \text{String}$ never returns a string (because it diverges, raises an exception or invokes a continuation), and so that same value casted to $A \rightarrow \text{Number}$ might be a perfectly valid inhabitant of that type. In summary the “eager” cast semantics is in fact overly eager: in its effort to find bugs faster than “lazy” semantics it disables the very type-based reasoning that gradual typing should provide.

While criticisms of transient semantics on the basis of type soundness have been made before [Greenman and Felleisen 2018], our development shows that the η principles of types are enough to uniquely determine a cast semantics, and helps clarify the trade-off between eager and lazy semantics of function casts.

Technical Overview of GTT. The gradual type theory developed in this paper unifies our previous work on operational (logical relations) reasoning for gradual typing in a call-by-value setting [New and Ahmed 2018] (which did not consider a proof theory), and on an axiomatic proof theory for gradual typing [New and Licata 2018] in a call-by-name setting (which considered only function and product types, and denotational but not operational models).

In this paper, we develop an axiomatic gradual type theory GTT for a unified language that includes *both* call-by-value/eager types and call-by-name/lazy types (Sections 2, 3), and show that it is sound for contextual equivalence via a logical relations model (Sections 4, 5, 6). Because the η principles for types play a key role in our approach, it is necessary to work in a setting where we can have η principles for both eager and lazy types. We use Levy’s Call-by-Push-Value [Levy 2003] (CBPV), which fully and faithfully embeds both call-by-value and call-by-name evaluation with both eager and lazy datatypes,² and underlies much recent work on reasoning about effectful programs [Bauer and Pretnar 2013; Lindley et al. 2017]. GTT can prove results in and about existing call-by-value gradually typed languages, and also suggests a design for call-by-name and full call-by-push-value gradually typed languages.

In the prior work [New and Licata 2018; New and Ahmed 2018], gradual type casts are decomposed into upcasts and downcasts, as suggested above. A *type dynamism* relation (corresponding to type precision [Siek et al. 2015a] and naïve subtyping [Wadler and Findler 2009]) controls which casts exist: a type dynamism $A \sqsubseteq A'$ induces an upcast from A to A' and a downcast from A' to A . Then, a *term dynamism* judgement is used for equational/approximational reasoning about programs. Term dynamism relates two terms whose types are related by type dynamism, and the upcasts and downcasts are each *specified* by certain term dynamism judgements holding. This specification axiomatizes only the properties

²The distinction between “lazy” vs “eager” casts above is different than lazy vs. eager datatypes.

of casts needed to ensure the graduality theorem, and not their precise behavior, so cast reductions can be *proved from it*, rather than stipulated in advance. The specification defines the casts “uniquely up to equivalence”, which means that any two implementations satisfying it are behaviorally equivalent.

We generalize this axiomatic approach to call-by-push-value (Section 2), where there are both eager/value types and lazy/computation types. This is both a subtler question than it might at first seem, and has a surprisingly nice answer: we find that upcasts are naturally associated with eager/value types and downcasts with lazy/computation types, and that the modalities relating values and computations induce the downcasts for eager/value types and upcasts for lazy/computation types. Moreover, this analysis articulates an important behavioral property of casts that was proved operationally for call-by-value in [New and Ahmed 2018] but missed for call-by-name in [New and Licata 2018]: upcasts for eager types and downcasts for lazy types are both “pure” in a suitable sense, which enables more refactorings and program optimizations. In particular, we show that these casts can be taken to be (and are essentially forced to be) “complex values” and “complex stacks” (respectively) in call-by-push-value, which corresponds to a behavioral property of *thinkability* and *linearity* [Munch-Maccagnoni 2014]. We argue in Section 7 that this property is related to blame soundness. Our gradual type theory naturally has two dynamic types, a dynamic eager/value type and a dynamic lazy/computation type, where the former can be thought of as a sum of all possible values, and the latter as a product of all possible behaviors. At the language design level, gradual type theory can be used to prove that, for a variety of eager/value and lazy/computation types, the “lazy” semantics of casts is the unique implementation satisfying β , η and graduality (Section 3). These behavioral equivalences can then be used in reasoning about optimizations, refactorings, and correctness of specific programs.

Contract-Based Models. To show the consistency of GTT as a theory, and to give a concrete operational interpretation of its axioms and rules, we provide a concrete model based on an operational semantics. The model is a *contract* interpretation of GTT in that the “built-in” casts of GTT are translated to ordinary functions in a CBPV language that perform the necessary checks.

To keep the proofs high-level, we break the proof into two steps. First (Sections 4, 5), we translate the axiomatic theory of GTT into an axiomatic theory of CBPV extended with recursive types and an uncatchable error, implementing casts by CBPV code that does contract checking. Then (Section 6) we give an operational semantics for the extended CBPV and define a step-indexed biorthogonal logical relation that interprets the ordering relation on terms as contextual error approximation, which underlies the definition of graduality as presented in [New and Ahmed 2018]. Combining these theorems gives an implementation of the term

language of GTT in which β, η are observational equivalences and the dynamic gradual guarantee is satisfied.

Due to the uniqueness theorems of GTT, the only part of this translation that is not predetermined is the definition of the dynamic types themselves and the casts between “ground” types and the dynamic types. We use CBPV to explore the design space of possible implementations of the dynamic types, and give one that faithfully distinguishes all types of GTT, and another more Scheme-like implementation that implements sums and lazy pairs by tag bits. Both can be restricted to the CBV or CBN subsets of CBPV, but the unrestricted variant is actually more faithful to Scheme-like dynamically typed programming, because it accounts for variable-argument functions. Our modular proof architecture allows us to easily prove correctness of β, η and graduality for all of these interpretations.

Contributions. The main contributions of the paper are as follows.

- (1) We present Gradual Type Theory in Section 2, a simple axiomatic theory of gradual typing. The theory axiomatizes three simple assumptions about a gradual language: compositionality, graduality, and type-based reasoning in the form of η equivalences.
- (2) We prove many theorems in the formal logic of Gradual Type Theory in Section 3. These include the unique implementation theorems for casts, which show that for each type connective of GTT, the η principle for the type ensures that the casts must implement the lazy contract semantics. Furthermore, we show that upcasts are always pure functions and dually that downcasts are always strict functions, as long as the base type casts are pure/strict.
- (3) To substantiate that GTT is a reasonable axiomatic theory for gradual typing, we construct *models* of GTT in Sections 4, 5 and 6.3. This proceeds in two stages. First (Section 4), we use call-by-push-value as a typed metalanguage to construct several models of GTT using different recursive types to implement the dynamic types of GTT and interpret the casts as embedding-projection pairs. This extends standard translations of dynamic typing into static typing using type tags: the dynamic value type is constructed as a recursive sum of basic value types, but dually the dynamic computation type is constructed as a recursive *product* of basic computation types. This dynamic computation type naturally models stack-based implementations of variable-arity functions as used in the Scheme language.
- (4) We then give an operational model of the term dynamism ordering as contextual error approximation in Sections 5 and 6.3. To construct this model, we extend previous work on logical relations for error approximation from call-by-value to call-by-push-value [New and Ahmed 2018], simplifying the presentation in the process.

2 AXIOMATIC GRADUAL TYPE THEORY

In this section we introduce the syntax of Gradual Type Theory, an extension of Call-by-push-value [Levy 2003] to support the constructions of gradual typing. First we introduce call-by-push-value and then describe in turn the gradual typing features: dynamic types, casts, and the dynamism orderings on types and terms.

2.1 Background: Call-by-Push-Value

GTT is an extension of CBPV, so we first present CBPV as the unshaded rules in Figure 1. CBPV makes a distinction between *value types* A and *computation types* \underline{B} , where value types classify *values* $\Gamma \vdash V : A$ and computation types classify *computations* $\Gamma \vdash M : \underline{B}$. Effects are computations: for example, we might have an error computation $\underline{U}_{\underline{B}} : \underline{B}$ of every computation type, or printing $\text{print } V ; M : \underline{B}$ if $V : \text{string}$ and $M : \underline{B}$, which prints V and then behaves as M .

Value types and complex values. The value types include *eager* products 1 and $A_1 \times A_2$ and sums 0 and $A_1 + A_2$, which behave as in a call-by-value/eager language (e.g. a pair is only a value when its components are). The notion of value V is more permissive than one might expect, and expressions $\Gamma \vdash V : A$ are sometimes called *complex values* to emphasize this point: complex values include not only closed runtime values, but also open values that have free value variables (e.g. $x : A_1, x_2 : A_2 \vdash (x_1, x_2) : A_1 \times A_2$), and expressions that pattern-match on values (e.g. $p : A_1 \times A_2 \vdash \text{split } p \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).(x_2, x_1) : A_2 \times A_1$). Thus, the complex values $x : A \vdash V : A'$ are a syntactic class of “pure functions” from A to A' (though there is no pure function *type* internalizing this judgement), which can be treated like values by a compiler because they have no effects (e.g. they can be dead-code-eliminated, common-subexpression-eliminated, and so on). In focusing [Andreoli 1992] terminology, complex values consist of left inversion and right focus rules. For each pattern-matching construct (e.g. case analysis on a sum, splitting a pair), we have both an elimination rule whose branches are values (e.g. $\text{split } p \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).V$) and one whose branches are computations (e.g. $\text{split } p \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).M$). To abbreviate the typing rules for both in Figure 1, we use the following convention: we write $E ::= V \mid M$ for either a complex value or a computation, and $T ::= A \mid \underline{B}$ for either a value type A or a computation type \underline{B} , and a judgement $\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash E : T$ for either $\Gamma \vdash V : A$ or $\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M : \underline{B}$ (this is a bit of an abuse of notation because Δ is not present in the former). Complex values can be translated away without loss of expressiveness by moving all pattern-matching into computations (see Section 5), at the expense of using a behavioral condition of *thunkability* [Munch-Maccagnoni 2014] to capture the properties complex values have (for example, an analogue of $\text{let } x = V ; \text{let } x' = V' ; M \equiv \text{let } x' = V' ; \text{let } x = V ; M$ — complex values can be reordered, while arbitrary computations cannot).

$A ::=$	$\text{?} \mid \underline{UB} \mid 0 \mid A_1 + A_2 \mid 1 \mid A_1 \times A_2$	$\underline{B} ::=$	$\underline{\zeta} \mid \underline{FA} \mid \top \mid \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \mid A \rightarrow \underline{B}$
$V ::=$	$\langle A' \prec A \rangle V \mid x \mid \text{abort } V$ $\mid \text{inl } V \mid \text{inr } V$ $\mid \text{case } V\{x_1.V_1 \mid x_2.V_2\}$ $\mid () \mid \text{split } V \text{ to } ().V'$ $\mid (V_1, V_2) \mid \text{split } V \text{ to } (x, y).V'$ $\mid \text{thunk } M$	$M, S ::=$	$\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle M \mid \bullet \mid \underline{U}_{\underline{B}}$ $\mid \text{abort } V \mid \text{case } V\{x_1.M_1 \mid x_2.M_2\}$ $\mid \text{split } V \text{ to } ().M \mid \text{split } V \text{ to } (x, y).M$ $\mid \text{force } V \mid \text{ret } V \mid \text{bind } x \leftarrow M; N$ $\mid \lambda x : A.M \mid MV$ $\mid \{\} \mid \{\pi \mapsto M_1 \mid \pi' \mapsto M_2\}$ $\mid \pi M \mid \pi' M$
$\Gamma ::=$	$\cdot \mid \Gamma, x : A$	$\Delta ::=$	$\cdot \mid \bullet : \underline{B}$
$\Phi ::=$	$\cdot \mid \Phi, x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A'$	$\Psi ::=$	$\cdot \mid \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$

$T ::= A \mid \underline{B}$
 $E ::= V \mid M$

$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash V : A \text{ and } \Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M : \underline{B}}$

UPCAST
 $\frac{\Gamma \vdash V : A \quad A \sqsubseteq A'}{\Gamma \vdash \langle A' \prec A \rangle V : A'}$

DNCAST
 $\frac{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M : \underline{B}' \quad \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle M : \underline{B}}$

		VAR	HOLE	ERR		
		$\frac{}{\Gamma, x : A, \Gamma' \vdash x : A}$	$\frac{}{\Gamma \mid \bullet : \underline{B} \vdash \bullet : \underline{B}}$	$\frac{}{\Gamma \mid \cdot \vdash \underline{U}_{\underline{B}} : \underline{B}}$		
				+E	$\Gamma \vdash V : A_1$	
0E	$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash V : 0}$	+lE	$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash V : A_1}$	+lR	$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash V : A_2}$	$\frac{}{\Gamma, x_1 : A_1 \mid \Delta, x_2 : A_2 \mid \Delta \vdash \text{case } V \{x_1.V_1 \mid x_2.V_2\}}$
		$\frac{}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \text{abort } V : T}$	$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inl } V : A_1 + A_2}$	$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inr } V : A_1 + A_2}$		
				×E	$\Gamma \vdash V : A_1 \times A_2$	
1I	$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash () : 1}$	1E	$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash V : 1}$	$\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash E : T$	×I	$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash V_1 : A_1, \Gamma \vdash V_2 : A_2}$
		$\frac{}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \text{split } V \text{ to } ().E : T}$			$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash (V_1, V_2) : A_1 \times A_2}$	$\frac{}{\Gamma, x : A_1, y : A_2 \mid \Delta \vdash \text{split } V \text{ to } (x, y).E : T}$
UI	$\frac{}{\Gamma \mid \cdot \vdash M : \underline{B}}$	UE	$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash V : \underline{UB}}$	FI	$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash V : A}$	FE
		$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{thunk } M : \underline{UB}}$	$\frac{}{\Gamma \mid \cdot \vdash \text{force } V : \underline{B}}$	$\frac{}{\Gamma \mid \cdot \vdash \text{ret } V : \underline{FA}}$	$\frac{}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \text{bind } x \leftarrow M; N}$	
		→I	$\frac{}{\Gamma, x : A \mid \Delta \vdash M : \underline{B}}$	→E	$\frac{}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M : A \rightarrow \underline{B}}$	$\Gamma \vdash V : A$
		$\frac{}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \lambda x : A.M : A \rightarrow \underline{B}}$		$\frac{}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash MV : \underline{B}}$		
τI	$\frac{}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \{\} : \top}$	&I	$\frac{}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M_1 : \underline{B}_1, \Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M_2 : \underline{B}_2}$	&E	$\frac{}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M : \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2}$	&E'
		$\frac{}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \{\pi \mapsto M_1 \mid \pi' \mapsto M_2\} : \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2}$		$\frac{}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \pi M : \underline{B}_1}$		$\frac{}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M}$

Proc. ACM Program. Lang., Vol. 3, No. POPL, Article 152, Publication date: January 2019.

Fig. 1. GTT Syntax and Term Typing

Shifts. A key notion in CBPV is the *shift* types $\underline{F}A$ and $U\underline{B}$, which mediate between value and computation types: $\underline{F}A$ is the computation type of potentially effectful programs that return a value of type A , while $U\underline{B}$ is the value type of thunked computations of type \underline{B} . The introduction rule for $\underline{F}A$ is returning a value of type A ($\text{ret } V$), while the elimination rule is sequencing a computation $M : \underline{F}A$ with a computation $x : A \vdash N : \underline{B}$ to produce a computation of a \underline{B} ($\text{bind } x \leftarrow M; N$). While any closed complex value V is equivalent to an actual value, a computation of type $\underline{F}A$ might perform effects (e.g. printing) before returning a value, or might error or non-terminate and not return a value at all. The introduction and elimination rules for U are written $\text{thunk } M$ and $\text{force } V$, and say that computations of type \underline{B} are bijective with values of type $U\underline{B}$. As an example of the action of the shifts, 0 is the empty value type, so $\underline{F}0$ classifies effectful computations that never return, but may perform effects (and then, must e.g. non-terminate or error), while $U\underline{F}0$ is the value type where such computations are thunked/delayed and considered as values. 1 is the trivial value type, so $\underline{F}1$ is the type of computations that can perform effects with the possibility of terminating successfully by returning $()$, and $U\underline{F}1$ is the value type where such computations are delayed values. $U\underline{F}$ is a monad on value types [Moggi 1991], while $\underline{F}U$ is a comonad on computation types.

Computation types. The computation type constructors in CBPV include lazy unit/products \top and $\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2$, which behave as in a call-by-name/lazy language (e.g. a component of a lazy pair is evaluated only when it is projected). Functions $A \rightarrow \underline{B}$ have a value type as input and a computation type as a result. The equational theory of effects in CBPV computations may be surprising to those familiar only with call-by-value, because at higher computation types effects have a call-by-name-like equational theory. For example, at computation type $A \rightarrow \underline{B}$, we have an equality $\text{print } c; \lambda x. M = \lambda x. \text{print } c; M$. Intuitively, the reason is that $A \rightarrow \underline{B}$ is not treated as an *observable* type (one where computations are run): the states of the operational semantics are only those computations of type $\underline{F}A$ for some value type A . Thus, “running” a function computation means supplying it with an argument, and applying both of the above to an argument V is defined to result in $\text{print } c; M[V/x]$. This does *not* imply that the corresponding equations holds for the call-by-value function type, which we discuss below. As another example, *all* computations are considered equal at type \top , even computations that perform different effects ($\text{print } c$ vs. $\{\}$ vs. \mathcal{U}), because there is by definition *no* way to extract an observable of type $\underline{F}A$ from a computation of type \top . Consequently, $U\top$ is isomorphic to 1 .

Complex stacks. Just as the complex values V are a syntactic class terms that have no effects, CBPV includes a judgement for “stacks” S , a syntactic class of terms that reflect *all* effects of their input. A stack $\Gamma \mid \bullet : \underline{B} \vdash S : \underline{B}'$ can be thought of as a linear/strict function from \underline{B} to \underline{B}' , which *must* use its input hole \bullet *exactly* once at the head redex position. Consequently, effects can be hoisted out of stacks, because

we know the stack will run them exactly once and first. For example, there will be contextual equivalences $S[\mathcal{U}/\bullet] = \mathcal{U}$ and $S[\text{print } V; M] = \text{print } V; S[M/\bullet]$. Just as complex values include pattern-matching, *complex stacks* include pattern-matching on values and introduction forms for the stack's output type. For example, $\bullet : \underline{B}_1 \ \& \ \underline{B}_2 \vdash \{\pi \mapsto \pi' \bullet \mid \pi' \mapsto \pi \bullet\} : \underline{B}_2 \ \& \ \underline{B}_1$ is a complex stack, even though it mentions \bullet more than once, because running it requires choosing a projection to get to an observable of type $\underline{F}A$, so *each time it is run* it uses \bullet exactly once. In focusing terms, complex stacks include both left and right inversion, and left focus rules. In the equational theory of CBPV, \underline{F} and \underline{U} are *adjoint*, in the sense that stacks $\bullet : \underline{F}A \vdash S : \underline{B}$ are bijective with values $x : A \vdash V : \underline{U}\underline{B}$, as both are bijective with computations $x : A \vdash M : \underline{B}$.

To compress the presentation in Figure 1, we use a typing judgement $\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M : \underline{B}$ with a “stoup”, a typing context Δ that is either empty or contains exactly one assumption $\bullet : \underline{B}$, so $\Gamma \mid \cdot \vdash M : \underline{B}$ is a computation, while $\Gamma \mid \bullet : \underline{B} \vdash M : \underline{B}'$ is a stack. The typing rules for \top and $\&$ treat the stoup additively (it is arbitrary in the conclusion and the same in all premises); for a function application to be a stack, the stack input must occur in the function position. The elimination form for $\underline{U}\underline{B}$, force V , is the prototypical non-stack computation (Δ is required to be empty), because forcing a thunk does not use the stack's input.

Embedding call-by-value and call-by-name. To translate call-by-value (CBV) into CBPV, a judgement $x_1 : A_1, \dots, x_n : A_n \vdash e : A$ is interpreted as a computation $x_1 : A_1^v, \dots, x_n : A_n^v \vdash e^v : \underline{F}A^v$, where call-by-value products and sums are interpreted as \times and $+$, and the call-by-value function type $A \rightarrow A'$ as $\underline{U}(A^v \rightarrow \underline{F}A'^v)$. Thus, a call-by-value term $e : A \rightarrow A'$, which should mean an effectful computation of a function value, is translated to a computation $e^v : \underline{F}\underline{U}(A^v \rightarrow \underline{F}A'^v)$. Here, the comonad $\underline{F}\underline{U}$ offers an opportunity to perform effects *before* returning a function value—so under translation the CBV terms $\text{print } c; \lambda x. e$ and $\lambda x. \text{print } c; e$ will not be contextually equivalent. To translate call-by-name (CBN) to CBPV, a judgement $x_1 : \underline{B}_1, \dots, x_m : \underline{B}_m \vdash e : \underline{B}$ is translated to $x_1 : \underline{U}\underline{B}_1^n, \dots, x_m : \underline{U}\underline{B}_m^n \vdash e^n : \underline{B}^n$, representing the fact that call-by-name terms are passed thunked arguments. Product types are translated to \top and \times , while a CBN function $B \rightarrow B'$ is translated to $\underline{U}\underline{B}^n \rightarrow \underline{B}'^n$ with a thunked argument. Sums $B_1 + B_2$ are translated to $\underline{F}(\underline{U}\underline{B}_1^n + \underline{U}\underline{B}_2^n)$, making the “lifting” in lazy sums explicit. Call-by-push-value *subsumes* call-by-value and call-by-name in that these embeddings are *full and faithful*: two CBV or CBN programs are equivalent if and only if their embeddings into CBPV are equivalent, and every CBPV program with a CBV or CBN type can be back-translated.

Extensionality/ η Principles. The main advantage of CBPV for our purposes is that it accounts for the η /extensionality principles of both eager/value and lazy/computation

types, because value types have η principles relating them to the value assumptions in the context Γ , while computation types have η principles relating them to the result type of a computation \underline{B} . For example, the η principle for sums says that any complex value or computation $x : A_1 + A_2 \vdash E : T$ is equivalent to case $x\{x_1.E[\text{inl } x_1/x] \mid x_2.E[\text{inr } x_2/x]\}$, i.e. a case on a value can be moved to any point in a program (where all variables are in scope) in an optimization. Given this, the above translations of CBV and CBN into CBPV explain why η for sums holds in CBV but not CBN: in CBV, $x : A_1 + A_2 \vdash E : T$ is translated to a term with $x : A_1 + A_2$ free, but in CBN, $x : B_1 + B_2 \vdash E : T$ is translated to a term with $x : \underline{UF}(\underline{UB}_1 + \underline{UB}_2)$ free, and the type $\underline{UF}(\underline{UB}_1 + \underline{UB}_2)$ of monadic computations that return a sum does not satisfy the η principle for sums in CBPV. Dually, the η principle for functions in CBPV is that any computation $M : A \rightarrow \underline{B}$ is equal to $\lambda x.M x$. A CBN term $e : B \rightarrow B'$ is translated to a CBPV computation of type $\underline{UB} \rightarrow B'$, to which CBPV function extensionality applies, while a CBV term $e : A \rightarrow A'$ is translated to a computation of type $\underline{FU}(A \rightarrow \underline{FA}')$, which does not satisfy the η rule for functions. We discuss a formal statement of these η principles with term dynamism below.

2.2 The Dynamic Type(s)

Next, we discuss the additions that make CBPV into our gradual type theory GTT. A dynamic type plays a key role in gradual typing, and since GTT has two different kinds of types, we have a new question of whether the dynamic type should be a value type, or a computation type, or whether we should have *both* a dynamic value type and a dynamic computation type. Our modular, type-theoretic presentation of gradual typing allows us to easily explore these options, though we find that having both a dynamic value $?$ and a dynamic computation type $\underline{?}$ gives the most natural implementation (see Section 4.2). Thus, we add both $?$ and $\underline{?}$ to the grammar of types in Figure 1. We do *not* give introduction and elimination rules for the dynamic types, because we would like constructions in GTT to imply results for many different possible implementations of them. Instead, the terms for the dynamic types will arise from term dynamism and casts.

2.3 Type Dynamism

The *type dynamism* relation of gradual type theory is written $A \sqsubseteq A'$ and read as “ A is less dynamic than A' ”; intuitively, this means that A' supports more behaviors than A . Our previous work [New and Ahmed 2018; New and Licata 2018] analyzes this as the existence of an *upcast* from A to A' and a *downcast* from A' to A which form an embedding-projection pair (*ep pair*) for term error approximation (an ordering where runtime errors are minimal): the upcast followed by the downcast is a no-op, while the downcast followed by the upcast might error more than

$A \sqsubseteq A' \text{ and } \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}$	$\frac{\text{VTyREFL}}{A \sqsubseteq A}$	$\frac{\text{VTyTRANS} \quad A \sqsubseteq A' \quad A' \sqsubseteq A''}{A \sqsubseteq A''}$	$\frac{\text{CTyREFL}}{\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}}$
$\frac{\text{CTyTRANS} \quad \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'} \quad \underline{B'} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''}}{\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''}}$	$\frac{\text{VTyTOP}}{A \sqsubseteq ?}$	$\frac{\text{UMON} \quad \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}}{UB \sqsubseteq UB'}$	$\frac{+\text{MON} \quad A_1 \sqsubseteq A'_1 \quad A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_2}{A_1 + A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_1 + A'_2}$
	$\frac{\times\text{MON} \quad A_1 \sqsubseteq A'_1 \quad A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_2}{A_1 \times A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_1 \times A'_2}$		
$\frac{\text{CTyTOP}}{\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{\iota}}$	$\frac{F\text{MON} \quad A \sqsubseteq A'}{\underline{FA} \sqsubseteq \underline{FA'}}$	$\frac{\&\text{MON} \quad \underline{B}_1 \sqsubseteq \underline{B'_1} \quad \underline{B}_2 \sqsubseteq \underline{B'_2}}{\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \sqsubseteq \underline{B'_1} \& \underline{B'_2}}$	$\frac{\rightarrow\text{MON} \quad A \sqsubseteq A' \quad \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}}{A \rightarrow \underline{B} \sqsubseteq A' \rightarrow \underline{B'}}$
Dynamism contexts	$\frac{}{\cdot \text{dyn-vctx}}$	$\frac{\Phi \text{ dyn-vctx} \quad A \sqsubseteq A'}{\Phi, x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A' \text{ dyn-vctx}}$	$\frac{}{\cdot \text{dyn-cctx}} \quad \frac{\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}}{(\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}) \text{ d}}$

Fig. 2. GTT Type Dynamism and Dynamism Contexts

the original term, because it imposes a run-time type check. Syntactically, type dynamism is defined (1) to be reflexive and transitive (a preorder), (2) where every type constructor is monotone in all positions, and (3) where the dynamic type is greatest in the type dynamism ordering. This last condition, *the dynamic type is the most dynamic type*, implies the existence of an upcast ($? \leftarrow A$) and a downcast ($A \leftarrow ?$) for every type A : any type can be embedded into it and projected from it. However, this by design does not characterize $?$ uniquely—instead, it is open-ended exactly which types exist (so that we can always add more), and some properties of the casts are undetermined; we exploit this freedom in Section 4.2.

This extends in a straightforward way to CBPV’s distinction between value and computation types in Figure 2: there is a type dynamism relation for value types $A \sqsubseteq A'$ and for computation types $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}$, which (1) each are preorders (VTyREFL, VTyTRANS, CTyREFL, CTyTRANS), (2) every type constructor is monotone (+MON, \times MON, &MON, \rightarrow MON) where the shifts \underline{F} and U switch which relation is being considered (UMON, FMON), and (3) the dynamic types $?$ and $\underline{\iota}$ are the most dynamic value and computation types respectively (VTyTOP, CTyTOP). For example, we have $U(A \rightarrow \underline{FA'}) \sqsubseteq U(? \rightarrow \underline{F?})$, which is the analogue of $A \rightarrow A' \sqsubseteq ? \rightarrow ?$ in call-by-value: because \rightarrow preserves embedding-retraction pairs, it is monotone, not contravariant, in the domain [New and Ahmed 2018; New and Licata 2018].

2.4 Casts

It is not immediately obvious how to add type casts to CPBV, because CPBV exposes finer judgemental distinctions than previous work considered. However, we can arrive at a first proposal by considering how previous work would be embedded into CPBV. In the previous work on both CBV and CBN [New and Ahmed 2018; New and Licata 2018] every type dynamism judgement $A \sqsubseteq A'$ induces both an upcast from A to A' and a downcast from A' to A . Because CBV types are associated to CPBV value types and CBN types are associated to CPBV computation types, this suggests that each value type dynamism $A \sqsubseteq A'$ should induce an upcast and a downcast, and each computation type dynamism $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$ should also induce an upcast and a downcast. In CBV, a cast from A to A' typically can be represented by a CBV function $A \rightarrow A'$, whose analogue in CPBV is $U(A \rightarrow \underline{FA}')$, and values of this type are bijective with computations $x : A \vdash M : \underline{FA}'$, and further with stacks $\bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash S : \underline{FA}'$. This suggests that a *value* type dynamism $A \sqsubseteq A'$ should induce an embedding-projection pair of *stacks* $\bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash S_u : \underline{FA}'$ and $\bullet : \underline{FA}' \vdash S_d : \underline{FA}$, which allow both the upcast and downcast to a priori be effectful computations. Dually, a CBN cast typically can be represented by a CBN function of type $B \rightarrow B'$, whose CPBV analogue is a computation of type $UB \rightarrow \underline{B}'$, which is equivalent with a computation $x : UB \vdash M : \underline{B}'$, and with a value $x : UB \vdash V : UB'$. This suggests that a *computation* type dynamism $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$ should induce an embedding-projection pair of *values* $x : UB \vdash V_u : UB'$ and $x : UB' \vdash V_d : UB$, where both the upcast and the downcast again may a priori be (co)effectful, in the sense that they may not reflect all effects of their input.

However, this analysis ignores an important property of CBV casts in practice: *upcasts* always terminate without performing any effects, and in some systems upcasts are even defined to be values, while only the *downcasts* are effectful (introduce errors). For example, for many types A , the upcast from A to $?$ is an injection into a sum/recursive type, which is a value constructor. Our previous work on a logical relation for call-by-value gradual typing [New and Ahmed 2018] proved that all upcasts were pure in this sense as a consequence of the embedding-projection pair properties (but their proof depended on the only effects being divergence and type error). In GTT, we can make this property explicit in the syntax of the casts, by making the upcast $\langle A' \preceq A \rangle$ induced by a value type dynamism $A \sqsubseteq A'$ itself a complex value, rather than computation. On the other hand, many downcasts between value types are implemented as a case-analysis looking for a specific tag and erroring otherwise, and so are not complex values.

We can also make a dual observation about CBN casts. The *downcast* arising from $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$ has a stronger property than being a computation $x : UB' \vdash M : \underline{B}$ as suggested above: it can be taken to be a stack $\bullet : \underline{B}' \vdash \langle \underline{B} \preceq \underline{B}' \rangle \bullet : \underline{B}$, because a downcasted computation evaluates the computation it is “wrapping” exactly

once. One intuitive justification for this point of view, which we make precise in Section 4, is to think of the dynamic computation type $\underline{\zeta}$ as a recursive *product* of all possible behaviors that a computation might have, and the downcast as a recursive type unrolling and product projection, which is a stack. From this point of view, an *upcast* can introduce errors, because the upcast of an object supporting some “methods” to one with all possible methods will error dynamically on the unimplemented ones.

These observations are expressed in the (shaded) **UPCAST** and **DNCASTS** rules for casts in Figure 1: the upcast for a value type dynamism is a complex value, while the downcast for a computation type dynamism is a stack (if its argument is). Indeed, this description of casts is simpler than the intuition we began the section with: rather than putting in both upcasts and downcasts for all value and computation type dynamisms, it suffices to put in only *upcasts* for *value* type dynamisms and *downcasts* for *computation* type dynamisms, because of monotonicity of type dynamism for U/F types. The *downcast* for a *value* type dynamism $A \sqsubseteq A'$, as a stack $\bullet : \underline{FA'} \vdash \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA'} \rangle \bullet : \underline{FA}$ as described above, is obtained from $\underline{FA} \sqsubseteq \underline{FA'}$ as computation types. The upcast for a computation type dynamism $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}$ as a value $x : \underline{UB} \vdash \langle \underline{UB'} \leftarrow \underline{UB} \rangle x : \underline{UB'}$ is obtained from $\underline{UB} \sqsubseteq \underline{UB'}$ as value types. Moreover, we will show below that the value upcast $\langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle$ induces a stack $\bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash \dots : \underline{FA'}$ that behaves like an upcast, and dually for the downcast, so this formulation implies the original formulation above.

We justify this design in two ways in the remainder of the paper. In Section 4, we show how to implement casts by a contract translation to CBPV where upcasts are complex values and downcasts are complex stacks. However, one goal of GTT is to be able to prove things about many gradually typed languages at once, by giving different models, so one might wonder whether this design rules out useful models of gradual typing where casts can have more general effects. In Theorem 3.26, we show instead that our design choice is forced for all casts, as long as the casts between ground types and the dynamic types are values/stacks.

2.5 Term Dynamism: Judgements and Structural Rules

The final piece of GTT is the *term dynamism* relation, a syntactic judgement that is used for reasoning about the behavioral properties of terms in GTT. To a first approximation, term dynamism can be thought of as syntactic rules for reasoning about *contextual approximation* relative to errors (not divergence), where $E \sqsubseteq E'$ means that either E errors or E and E' have the same result. However, a key idea in GTT is to consider a *heterogeneous* term dynamism judgement $E \sqsubseteq E' : T \sqsubseteq T'$ between terms $E : T$ and $E' : T'$ where $T \sqsubseteq T'$ —i.e. relating two terms at two different types, where the type on the right is more dynamic than the type on the left. This judgement structure allows simple axioms characterizing the behavior

$$\boxed{\Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A \sqsubseteq A' \text{ and } \Phi \mid \Psi \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{TM}_{\text{DYNREFL}} \\
\hline
\Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma \mid \Delta \sqsubseteq \Delta \vdash E \sqsubseteq E : T \sqsubseteq T
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TM}_{\text{DYNVAR}} \\
\hline
\Phi, x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A', \Phi' \vdash x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A'
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{TM}_{\text{DYNTRANS}} \\
\hline
\Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma' \mid \Delta \sqsubseteq \Delta' \vdash E \sqsubseteq E' : T \sqsubseteq T' \\
\Gamma' \sqsubseteq \Gamma'' \mid \Delta' \sqsubseteq \Delta'' \vdash E' \sqsubseteq E'' : T' \sqsubseteq T'' \\
\hline
\Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma'' \mid \Delta \sqsubseteq \Delta'' \vdash E \sqsubseteq E'' : T \sqsubseteq T''
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TM}_{\text{DYNVALSUBST}} \\
\hline
\Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A \sqsubseteq A' \\
\Phi, x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A', \Phi' \mid \Psi \vdash E \sqsubseteq E' : T \sqsubseteq T' \\
\hline
\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash E[V/x] \sqsubseteq E'[V'/x'] : T \sqsubseteq T'
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{TM}_{\text{DYNHOLE}} \\
\hline
\Phi \mid \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'} \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TM}_{\text{DYNSTKSUBST}} \\
\hline
\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash M_1 \sqsubseteq M'_1 : \underline{B}_1 \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_1 \\
\Phi \mid \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B}_1 \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_1 \vdash M_2 \sqsubseteq M'_2 : \underline{B}_2 \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_2 \\
\hline
\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash M_2[M_1/\bullet] \sqsubseteq M'_2[M'_1/\bullet] : \underline{B}_2 \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_2
\end{array}$$

Fig. 3. GTT Term Dynamism (Structural Rules)

of casts [New and Licata 2018] and axiomatizes the graduality property [Siek et al. 2015a]. Here, we break this judgement up into value dynamism $V \sqsubseteq V' : A \sqsubseteq A'$ and computation dynamism $M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}$. To support reasoning about open terms, the full form of the judgements are

- $\Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma' \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A \sqsubseteq A'$ where $\Gamma \vdash V : A$ and $\Gamma' \vdash V' : A'$ and $\Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma'$ and $A \sqsubseteq A'$.
- $\Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma' \mid \Delta \sqsubseteq \Delta' \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}$ where $\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M : \underline{B}$ and $\Gamma' \mid \Delta' \vdash M' : \underline{B'}$.

where $\Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma'$ is the pointwise lifting of value type dynamism, and $\Delta \sqsubseteq \Delta'$ is the optional lifting of computation type dynamism. We write $\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma'$ and $\Psi : \Delta \sqsubseteq \Delta'$ as syntax for “zipped” pairs of contexts that are pointwise related by type dynamism, $x_1 \sqsubseteq x'_1 : A_1 \sqsubseteq A'_1, \dots, x_n \sqsubseteq x'_n : A_n \sqsubseteq A'_n$, which correctly suggests that one can substitute related terms for related variables. We will implicitly zip/unzip pairs of contexts, and sometimes write e.g. $\Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma$ to mean $x \sqsubseteq x : A \sqsubseteq A$ for all $x : A$ in Γ .

The main point of our rules for term dynamism is that *there are no type-specific axioms in the definition* beyond the $\beta\eta$ -axioms that the type satisfies in a non-gradual language. Thus, adding a new type to gradual type theory does not require any a priori consideration of its gradual behavior in the language definition; instead, this is deduced as a theorem in the type theory. The basic structural rules of term dynamism in Figure 3 and Figure 4 say that it is reflexive and transitive (TM_{DYNREFL}, TM_{DYNTRANS}), that assumptions can be used and substituted for (TM_{DYNVAR}, TM_{DYNVALSUBST}, TM_{DYNHOLE}, TM_{DYNSTKSUBST}), and that every term constructor is monotone (the CONG rules). While we could add congruence

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{+ILCONG} \quad \frac{\Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A_1 \sqsubseteq A'_1}{\Phi \vdash \text{inl } V \sqsubseteq \text{inl } V' : A_1 + A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_1 + A'_2} \quad \text{+IRCONG} \quad \frac{\Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_2}{\Phi \vdash \text{inr } V \sqsubseteq \text{inr } V' : A_1 + A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_1 + A'_2} \\
\\
\text{+ECONG} \quad \frac{\begin{array}{c} \Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A_1 + A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_1 + A'_2 \\ \Phi, x_1 \sqsubseteq x'_1 : A_1 \sqsubseteq A'_1 \mid \Psi \vdash E_1 \sqsubseteq E'_1 : T \sqsubseteq T' \\ \Phi, x_2 \sqsubseteq x'_2 : A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_2 \mid \Psi \vdash E_2 \sqsubseteq E'_2 : T \sqsubseteq T' \end{array}}{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash \text{case } V\{x_1.E_1 \mid x_2.E_2\} \sqsubseteq \text{case } V\{x'_1.E'_1 \mid x'_2.E'_2\} : T'} \quad \text{0ECONG} \quad \frac{\Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : 0 \sqsubseteq 0}{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash \text{abort } V \sqsubseteq \text{abort } V'} \\
\\
\text{1ECONG} \quad \frac{\text{1ICONG} \quad \frac{}{\Phi \vdash () \sqsubseteq () : 1 \sqsubseteq 1} \quad \frac{\Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : 1 \sqsubseteq 1 \quad \Phi \mid \Psi \vdash E \sqsubseteq E' : T \sqsubseteq T'}{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash \text{split } V \text{ to } () . E \sqsubseteq \text{split } V \text{ to } () . E' : T \sqsubseteq T'}}{} \\
\\
\text{xICONG} \quad \frac{\begin{array}{c} \Phi \vdash V_1 \sqsubseteq V'_1 : A_1 \sqsubseteq A'_1 \\ \Phi \vdash V_2 \sqsubseteq V'_2 : A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_2 \end{array}}{\Phi \vdash (V_1, V_2) \sqsubseteq (V'_1, V'_2) : A_1 \times A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_1 \times A'_2} \quad \text{→ICONG} \quad \frac{\Phi, x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A' \mid \Psi \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}}{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash \lambda x : A . M \sqsubseteq \lambda x' : A' . M' : A \rightarrow \underline{B} \sqsubseteq A' \rightarrow \underline{B}} \\
\\
\text{xECONG} \quad \frac{\begin{array}{c} \Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A_1 \times A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_1 \times A'_2 \\ \Phi, x \sqsubseteq x' : A_1 \sqsubseteq A'_1, y \sqsubseteq y' : A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_2 \mid \Psi \vdash E \sqsubseteq E' : T \sqsubseteq T' \end{array}}{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash \text{split } V \text{ to } (x, y) . E \sqsubseteq \text{split } V' \text{ to } (x', y') . E' : T \sqsubseteq T'} \quad \text{→ECONG} \quad \frac{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : A \rightarrow \underline{B} \sqsubseteq A' \quad \Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A \sqsubseteq A'}{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash M V \sqsubseteq M' V' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}} \\
\\
\text{UICONG} \quad \frac{\Phi \mid \cdot \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}}{\Phi \vdash \text{thunk } M \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } M' : \underline{UB} \sqsubseteq \underline{UB'}} \quad \text{UECONG} \quad \frac{\Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : \underline{UB} \sqsubseteq \underline{UB'}}{\Phi \mid \cdot \vdash \text{force } V \sqsubseteq \text{force } V' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}} \\
\\
\text{FICONG} \quad \frac{\Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A \sqsubseteq A'}{\Phi \mid \cdot \vdash \text{ret } V \sqsubseteq \text{ret } V' : \underline{FA} \sqsubseteq \underline{FA'}} \quad \text{FECONG} \quad \frac{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{FA} \sqsubseteq \underline{FA'} \quad \Phi, x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A' \mid \cdot \vdash N \sqsubseteq N' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}}{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash \text{bind } x \leftarrow M; N \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' \leftarrow M'; N' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}} \\
\\
\text{TI CONG} \quad \frac{}{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash \{\} \sqsubseteq \{\} : \top \sqsubseteq \top} \quad \text{\&ICONG} \quad \frac{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash M_1 \sqsubseteq M'_1 : \underline{B}_1 \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_1 \quad \Phi \mid \Psi \vdash M_2 \sqsubseteq M'_2 : \underline{B}_2 \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_2}{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash \{\pi \mapsto M_1 \mid \pi' \mapsto M_2\} \sqsubseteq \{\pi \mapsto M'_1 \mid \pi' \mapsto M'_2\} : \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2} \\
\\
\text{\&ECONG} \quad \frac{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2}{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash \pi M \sqsubseteq \pi M' : \underline{B}_1 \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_1} \quad \text{\&E'CONG} \quad \frac{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2}{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash \pi' M \sqsubseteq \pi' M' : \underline{B}_2 \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_2}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 4. GTT Term Dynamism (Congruence Rules)

rules for errors and casts, these follow from the axioms characterizing their behavior below.

We will often abbreviate a “homogeneous” term dynamism (where the type or context dynamism is given by reflexivity) by writing e.g. $\Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A \sqsubseteq A'$ for $\Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A \sqsubseteq A'$, or $\Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A$ for $\Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A \sqsubseteq A$, and similarly for computations. The entirely homogeneous judgements $\Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A$ and $\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B}$ can be thought of as a syntax for contextual error approximation (as we prove below). We write $V \sqsupseteq V'$ (“equidynamism”) to mean term dynamism relations in both directions (which requires that the types are also equidynamic $\Gamma \sqsupseteq \Gamma'$ and $A \sqsubseteq A'$), which is a syntactic judgement for contextual equivalence.

2.6 Term Dynamism: Axioms

Finally, we assert some term dynamism axioms that describe the behavior of programs. The cast universal properties at the top of Figure 5, following [New and Licata \[2018\]](#), say that the defining property of an upcast from A to A' is that it is the least dynamic term of type A' that is more dynamic than x , a “least upper bound”. That is, $\langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x$ is a term of type A' that is more dynamic than x (the “bound” rule), and for any other term x' of type A' that is more dynamic than x , $\langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x$ is less dynamic than x' (the “best” rule). Dually, the downcast $\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \bullet$ is the most dynamic term of type \underline{B} that is less dynamic than \bullet , a “greatest lower bound”. These defining properties are entirely independent of the types involved in the casts, and do not change as we add or remove types from the system.

We will show that these defining properties already imply that the shift of the upcast $\langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle$ forms a Galois connection/adjunction with the downcast $\langle \underline{F}A \leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle$, and dually for computation types (see Theorem 3.9). They do not automatically form a Galois insertion/coreflection/embedding-projection pair, but we can add this by the retract axioms in Figure 5. Together with other theorems of GTT, these axioms imply that any upcast followed by its corresponding downcast is the identity (see Theorem 3.10). This specification of casts leaves some behavior undefined: for example, we cannot prove in the theory that $\langle \underline{F}1 + 1 \leftarrow \underline{F}? \rangle \langle ? \hookrightarrow 1 \rangle$ reduces to an error. We choose this design because there are valid models in which it is not an error, for instance if the unique value of 1 is represented as the boolean true. In Section 4.2, we show additional axioms that fully characterize the behavior of the dynamic type.

The type universal properties in the middle of the figure, which are taken directly from CBPV, assert the $\beta\eta$ rules for each type as (homogeneous) term equidynamisms—these should be understood as having, as implicit premises, the typing conditions that make both sides type check, in equidynamic contexts.

The final axioms assert properties of the run-time error term \mathcal{U} : it is the least dynamic term (has the fewest behaviors) of every computation type, and all complex

Cast Universal Properties

	Bound	Best
Up	$x : A \vdash x \sqsubseteq \langle A' \prec A \rangle x : A \sqsubseteq A'$	$x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A' \vdash \langle A' \prec A \rangle x \sqsubseteq x' : A'$
Down	$\bullet : \underline{B}' \vdash \langle \underline{B} \prec \underline{B}' \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$	$\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}' \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{B} \prec \underline{B}' \rangle \bullet : \underline{B}$

Retract Axiom

$$x : A \vdash \langle \underline{F}A \prec \underline{F} \rangle (\text{ret } (\langle ? \prec A \rangle x)) \sqsubseteq \text{ret } x : \underline{F}A$$

$$x : \underline{U}\underline{B} \vdash \langle \underline{B} \prec \underline{\imath} \rangle (\text{force } (\langle \underline{U}\underline{\imath} \prec \underline{U}\underline{B} \rangle x)) \sqsubseteq \text{force } x : \underline{B}$$

Type Universal Properties

Type	β	η
+	$\text{case inl } V\{x_1.E_1 \mid \dots\} \sqsubseteq E_1[V/x_1]$ $\text{case inr } V\{\dots \mid x_2.E_2\} \sqsubseteq E_2[V/x_2]$	$E \sqsubseteq \text{case } x\{x_1.E[\text{inl } x_1/x] \mid x_2.E[\text{inr } x_2/x]\}$ where $x : A_1 + A_2 \vdash E : T$
0	—	$E \sqsubseteq \text{abort } x$ where $x : 0 \vdash E : T$
\times	$\text{split } (V_1, V_2) \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).E \sqsubseteq E[V_1/x_1, V_2/x_2]$	$E \sqsubseteq \text{split } x \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).E[(x_1, x_2)/x]$ where $x : A_1 \times A_2 \vdash E : T$
1	$\text{split } () \text{ to } ().E \sqsubseteq E$	$x : 1 \vdash E \sqsubseteq \text{split } x \text{ to } ().E[()/x]$ where $x : 1 \vdash E : T$
U	$\text{force thunk } M \sqsubseteq M$	$x : \underline{U}\underline{B} \vdash x \sqsubseteq \text{thunk force } x : \underline{U}\underline{B}$
F	$\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } V; M \sqsubseteq M[V/x]$	$\bullet : \underline{F}A \vdash \underline{M} \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; M[\text{ret } x/\bullet]$
\rightarrow	$(\lambda x : A.M) V \sqsubseteq M[V/x]$	$\bullet : A \rightarrow \underline{B} \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \lambda x : A. \bullet : x : A \rightarrow \underline{B}$
$\&$	$\pi\{\pi \mapsto M \mid \pi' \mapsto M'\} \sqsubseteq M$ $\pi'\{\pi \mapsto M \mid \pi' \mapsto M'\} \sqsubseteq M'$	$\bullet : \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \{\pi \mapsto \pi \bullet \mid \pi' \mapsto \pi' \bullet\}$
\top	—	$\bullet : \top \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \{\} : \top$

ERRBOT

$$\frac{\Gamma' \mid \cdot \vdash M' : \underline{B}'}{\Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma' \mid \cdot \vdash \underline{U} \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'}$$

STRICT

$$\frac{\Gamma \mid x : \underline{B} \vdash S : \underline{B}'}{\Gamma \mid \cdot \vdash S[\underline{U}\underline{B}] \sqsubseteq \underline{U}\underline{B}' : \underline{B}'}$$

Error Properties

Fig. 5. GTT Term Dynamism Axioms

stacks are strict in errors, because stacks force their evaluation position. We state the first axiom in a heterogeneous way, which includes congruence $\Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma' \vdash \underline{U}\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{U}\underline{B}' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$.

3 THEOREMS IN GRADUAL TYPE THEORY

In this section, we show that the axiomatics of gradual type theory determine most properties of casts, which shows that these behaviors of casts are forced in any implementation of gradual typing satisfying graduality and β, η .

3.1 Properties inherited from CBPV

Because the GTT term equidynamism relation \sqsubseteq includes the congruence and $\beta\eta$ axioms of the CBPV equational theory, types inherit the universal properties they have there [Levy 2003]. We recall some relevant definitions and facts.

Definition 3.1 (Isomorphism).

- (1) We write $A \cong_v A'$ for a *value isomorphism between A and A'* , which consists of two complex values $x : A \vdash V' : A'$ and $x' : A' \vdash V : A$ such that $x : A \vdash V[V'/x'] \sqsubseteq x : A$ and $x' : A' \vdash V'[V/x] \sqsubseteq x' : A'$.
- (2) We write $\underline{B} \cong_c \underline{B}'$ for a *computation isomorphism between \underline{B} and \underline{B}'* , which consists of two complex stacks $\bullet : \underline{B} \vdash S' : \underline{B}'$ and $\bullet' : \underline{B}' \vdash S : \underline{B}$ such that $\bullet : \underline{B} \vdash S[S'/x'] \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B}$ and $\bullet' : \underline{B}' \vdash S'[S/\bullet] \sqsubseteq \bullet' : \underline{B}'$.

Note that a value isomorphism is a strong condition, and an isomorphism in call-by-value between types A and A' corresponds to a computation isomorphism $\underline{FA} \cong \underline{FA'}$, and dually [Levy 2017].

LEMMA 3.2 (INITIAL OBJECTS).

- (1) For all (value or computation) types T , there exists a unique expression $x : 0 \vdash E : T$.
- (2) For all \underline{B} , there exists a unique stack $\bullet : \underline{F0} \vdash S : \underline{B}$.
- (3) 0 is strictly initial: Suppose there is a type A with a complex value $x : A \vdash V : 0$. Then V is an isomorphism $A \cong_v 0$.
- (4) $\underline{F0}$ is not provably strictly initial among computation types.

PROOF.

- (1) Take E to be $x : 0 \vdash \text{abort } x : T$. Given any E' , we have $E \sqsubseteq E'$ by the η principle for 0.
- (2) Take S to be $\bullet : \underline{F0} \vdash \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; \text{abort } x : \underline{B}$. Given another S' , by the η principle for F types, $S' \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; S'[\text{ret } x]$. By congruence, to show $S \sqsubseteq S'$, it suffices to show $x : 0 \vdash \text{abort } x \sqsubseteq S[\text{ret } x] : \underline{B}$, which is an instance of the previous part.
- (3) We have $y : 0 \vdash \text{abort } y : A$. The composite $y : 0 \vdash V[\text{abort } y/x] : 0$ is equidynamic with y by the η principle for 0, which says that any two complex values with domain 0 are equal.

The composite $x : A \vdash \text{abort } V : A$ is equidynamic with x , because

$$x : A, y : A, z : 0 \vdash x \sqsubseteq \text{abort } z \sqsubseteq y : A$$

where the first is by η with $x : A, y : A, z : 0 \vdash E[z] := x : A$ and the second with $x : 0, y : 0 \vdash E[z] := y : A$ (this depends on the fact that 0 is “distributive”, i.e. $\Gamma, x : 0$ has the universal property of 0). Substituting $\text{abort } V$ for y and V for z , we have $\text{abort } V \sqsubseteq x$.

- (4) $\underline{F}0$ is not *strictly* initial among computation types, though. Proof sketch: a domain model along the lines of [New and Licata 2018] with only non-termination and type errors shows this, because there $\underline{F}0$ and \top are isomorphic (the same object is both initial and terminal), so if $\underline{F}0$ were strictly initial (any type \underline{B} with a stack $\bullet : B \vdash S : \underline{F}0$ is isomorphic to $\underline{F}0$), then because every type \underline{B} has a stack to \top (terminal) and therefore $\underline{F}0$, every type would be isomorphic to $\top/\underline{F}0$ —i.e. the stack category would be trivial. But there are non-trivial computation types in this model.

□

LEMMA 3.3 (TERMINAL OBJECTS).

- (1) For any computation type \underline{B} , there exists a unique stack $\bullet : \underline{B} \vdash S : \top$.
- (2) (In any context Γ ,) there exists a unique complex value $V : U\top$.
- (3) (In any context Γ ,) there exists a unique complex value $V : 1$.
- (4) $U\top \cong_v 1$
- (5) \top is not a strict terminal object.

PROOF.

- (1) Take $S = \{\}$. The η rule for \top , $\bullet : \top \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \{\} : \top$, under the substitution of $\bullet : \underline{B} \vdash S : \top$, gives $S \sqsubseteq \{\}[S/\bullet] = \{\}$.
- (2) Take $V = \text{thunk } \{\}$. We have $x : U\top \vdash x \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \{\}$ force $x \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \{\} : U\top$ by the η rules for U and \top .
- (3) Take $V = ()$. By η for 1 with $x : 1 \vdash E[x] := () : 1$, we have $x : 1 \vdash () \sqsubseteq \text{unroll } x \text{ to roll } () : 1$. By η for 1 with $x : 1 \vdash E[x] := x : 1$, we have $x : 1 \vdash x \sqsubseteq \text{unroll } x \text{ to roll } () : 1$. Therefore $x : 1 \vdash x \sqsubseteq () : 1$.
- (4) We have maps $x : U\top \vdash () : 1$ and $x : 1 \vdash \text{thunk } \{\} : U\top$. The composite on 1 is the identity by the previous part. The composite on \top is the identity by part (2).
- (5) Proof sketch: As above, there is a domain model with $\top \cong \underline{F}0$, so if \top were a strict terminal object, then $\underline{F}0$ would be too. But $\underline{F}0$ is also initial, so it has a map to every type, and therefore every type would be isomorphic to $\underline{F}0$ and \top . But there are non-trivial computation types in the model.

□

3.2 Derived Cast Rules

As noted above, monotonicity of type dynamism for U and \underline{F} means that we have the following as instances of the general cast rules:

LEMMA 3.4 (SHIFTED CASTS). *The following are derivable:*

$$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M : \underline{F}A' \quad A \sqsubseteq A'}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \langle \underline{F}A \leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle M : \underline{F}A} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash V : U\underline{B} \quad \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'}{\Gamma \vdash \langle U\underline{B}' \leftarrow U\underline{B} \rangle V : U\underline{B}'}$$

PROOF. They are instances of the general upcast and downcast rules, using the fact that U and F are congruences for type dynamism, so in the first rule $\underline{FA} \sqsubseteq \underline{FA}'$, and in the second, $UB \sqsubseteq UB'$. \square

The cast universal properties in Figure 5 imply the following seemingly more general rules for reasoning about casts:

LEMMA 3.5 (UPCAST AND DOWNCAST LEFT AND RIGHT RULES). *The following are derivable:*

$$\frac{A \sqsubseteq A' \quad \Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A \sqsubseteq A'}{\Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq \langle A'' \leftarrow A' \rangle V' : A \sqsubseteq A''} \text{UPR} \quad \frac{\Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V'' : A \sqsubseteq A''}{\Phi \vdash \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle V \sqsubseteq V'' : A' \sqsubseteq A''} \text{UPL}$$

$$\frac{\underline{B'} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''} \quad \Phi \mid \Psi \vdash M' \sqsubseteq M'' : \underline{B'} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''}}{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle M' \sqsubseteq M'' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''}} \text{DNL} \quad \frac{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash M \sqsubseteq M'' : B \sqsubseteq B''}{\Phi \mid \Psi \vdash M \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{B'} \leftarrow \underline{B''} \rangle M'' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''}} \text{DNR}$$

In sequent calculus terminology, an upcast is left-invertible, while a downcast is right-invertible, in the sense that any time we have a conclusion with a upcast on the left/downcast on the right, we can without loss of generality apply these rules (this comes from upcasts and downcasts forming a Galois connection). We write the $A \sqsubseteq A'$ and $\underline{B'} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''}$ premises on the non-invertible rules to emphasize that the premise is not necessarily well-formed given that the conclusion is.

PROOF. For upcast left, substitute V' into the axiom $x \sqsubseteq \langle A'' \leftarrow A' \rangle x : A' \sqsubseteq A''$ to get $V' \sqsubseteq \langle A'' \leftarrow A' \rangle V'$, and then use transitivity with the premise.

For upcast right, by transitivity of

$$x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A' \vdash \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x \sqsubseteq x' : A' \sqsubseteq A' \quad x' \sqsubseteq x'' : A' \sqsubseteq A'' \vdash x' \sqsubseteq x'' : A' \sqsubseteq A''$$

we have

$$x \sqsubseteq x'' : A \sqsubseteq A'' \vdash \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x \sqsubseteq x'' : A' \sqsubseteq A''$$

Substituting the premise into this gives the conclusion.

For downcast left, substituting M' into the axiom $\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}$ gives $\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle M \sqsubseteq M$, and then transitivity with the premise gives the result.

For downcast right, transitivity of

$$\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'} \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'} \quad \bullet' \sqsubseteq \bullet'' : \underline{B'} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''} \vdash \bullet' \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{B'} \leftarrow \underline{B''} \rangle \bullet''$$

gives $\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet'' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''} \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{B'} \leftarrow \underline{B''} \rangle \bullet''$, and then substitution of the premise into this gives the conclusion. \square

Though we did not include congruence rules for casts in Figure 4, it is derivable:

LEMMA 3.6 (CAST CONGRUENCE RULES). *The following congruence rules for casts are derivable:*

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{A \sqsubseteq A' \quad A' \sqsubseteq A''}{x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A' \vdash \langle A'' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x \sqsubseteq \langle A'' \hookrightarrow A' \rangle x' : A''} \\
 \\
 \frac{A \sqsubseteq A' \quad A' \sqsubseteq A''}{x : A \vdash \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x \sqsubseteq \langle A'' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x : A' \sqsubseteq A''} \\
 \\
 \frac{\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'} \quad \underline{B'} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''}}{\bullet' \sqsubseteq \bullet'' : \underline{B'} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''} \vdash \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \bullet' \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B''} \rangle \bullet'' : \underline{B}} \\
 \\
 \frac{\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'} \quad \underline{B'} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''}}{\bullet'' : \underline{B''} \vdash \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B''} \rangle \bullet'' \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{B'} \leftarrow \underline{B''} \rangle \bullet'' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}}
 \end{array}$$

PROOF. In all cases, uses the invertible and then non-invertible rule for the cast. For the first rule, by upcast left, it suffices to show $x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A' \vdash x \sqsubseteq \langle A'' \hookrightarrow A' \rangle x' : A \sqsubseteq A''$ which is true by upcast right, using $x \sqsubseteq x'$ in the premise.

For the second, by upcast left, it suffices to show $x : A \vdash x \sqsubseteq \langle A'' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x : A \sqsubseteq A''$, which is true by upcast right.

For the third, by downcast right, it suffices to show $\bullet' \sqsubseteq \bullet'' : \underline{B'} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''} \vdash \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \bullet' \sqsubseteq \bullet'' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''}$, which is true by downcast left, using $\bullet' \sqsubseteq \bullet''$ in the premise.

For the fourth, by downcast right, it suffices show $\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B''} \rangle \bullet'' \sqsubseteq \bullet'' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''}$, which is true by downcast left. \square

3.3 Type-generic Properties of Casts

The universal property axioms for upcasts and downcasts in Figure 5 define them *uniquely* up to equidynamism (\sqsubseteq): anything with the same property is behaviorally equivalent to a cast.

THEOREM 3.7 (SPECIFICATION FOR CASTS IS A UNIVERSAL PROPERTY).

- (1) If $A \sqsubseteq A'$ and $x : A \vdash V : A'$ is a complex value such that $x : A \vdash x \sqsubseteq V : A \sqsubseteq A'$ and $x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A' \vdash V \sqsubseteq x' : A'$ then $x : A \vdash V \sqsubseteq \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x : A'$.
- (2) If $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}$ and $\bullet' : \underline{B'} \vdash S : \underline{B}$ is a complex stack such that $\bullet' : \underline{B'} \vdash S \sqsubseteq \bullet' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}$ and $\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'} \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq S : \underline{B}$ then $\bullet' : \underline{B'} \vdash S \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \bullet' : \underline{B}$

PROOF. For the first part, to show $\langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x \sqsubseteq V$, by upcast left, it suffices to show $x \sqsubseteq V : A \sqsubseteq A'$, which is one assumption. To show $V \sqsubseteq \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x$, we substitute into the second assumption with $x \sqsubseteq \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x : A \sqsubseteq A'$, which is true by upcast right.

For the second part, to show $S \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \bullet'$, by downcast right, it suffices to show $S \sqsubseteq \bullet' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}$, which is one of the assumptions. To show $\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \bullet' \sqsubseteq S$,

we substitute into the second assumption with $\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \bullet' \sqsubseteq \bullet'$, which is true by downcast left. \square

Casts satisfy an identity and composition law:

THEOREM 3.8 (CASTS (DE)COMPOSITION). *For any $A \sqsubseteq A' \sqsubseteq A''$ and $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}' \sqsubseteq \underline{B}''$:*

- (1) $x : A \vdash \langle A \leftarrow A \rangle x \sqsubseteq x : A$
- (2) $x : A \vdash \langle A'' \leftarrow A \rangle x \sqsubseteq \langle A'' \leftarrow A' \rangle \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x : A''$
- (3) $\bullet : \underline{B} \vdash \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B}$
- (4) $\bullet : \underline{B}'' \vdash \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle (\langle \underline{B}' \leftarrow \underline{B}'' \rangle \bullet) : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}$

PROOF. We use Theorem 3.7 in all cases, and show that the right-hand side has the universal property of the left.

- (1) Both parts expand to showing $x \sqsubseteq x : A \sqsubseteq A \vdash x \sqsubseteq x : A \sqsubseteq A$, which is true by assumption.
- (2) First, we need to show $x \sqsubseteq \langle A'' \leftarrow A' \rangle (\langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x) : A \sqsubseteq A''$. By upcast right, it suffices to show $x \sqsubseteq \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x : A \sqsubseteq A'$, which is also true by upcast right.
For $x \sqsubseteq x'' : A \sqsubseteq A'' \vdash \langle A'' \leftarrow A' \rangle (\langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x) \sqsubseteq x''$, by upcast left twice, it suffices to show $x \sqsubseteq x'' : A \sqsubseteq A''$, which is true by assumption.
- (3) Both parts expand to showing $\bullet : \underline{B} \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B}$, which is true by assumption.
- (4) To show $\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet'' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'' \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle (\langle \underline{B}' \leftarrow \underline{B}'' \rangle \bullet)$, by downcast right (twice), it suffices to show $\bullet : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \bullet'' : \underline{B}'' \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet'' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}''$, which is true by assumption. Next, we have to show $\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle (\langle \underline{B}' \leftarrow \underline{B}'' \rangle \bullet) \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}''$, and by downcast left, it suffices to show $\langle \underline{B}' \leftarrow \underline{B}'' \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B}' \sqsubseteq \underline{B}''$, which is also true by downcast left.

\square

In particular, this composition property implies that the casts into and out of the dynamic type are coherent, for example if $A \sqsubseteq A'$ then $\langle ? \leftarrow A \rangle x \sqsubseteq \langle ? \leftarrow A' \rangle \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x$.

The following theorem says essentially that $x \sqsubseteq \langle T \leftarrow T' \rangle \langle T' \leftarrow T \rangle x$ (upcast then downcast might error less but otherwise does not change the behavior) and $\langle T' \leftarrow T \rangle \langle T \leftarrow T' \rangle x \sqsubseteq x$ (downcast then upcast might error more but otherwise does not change the behavior). However, since a value type dynamism $A \sqsubseteq A'$ induces a value upcast $x : A \vdash \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x : A'$ but a stack downcast $\bullet : \underline{FA}' \vdash \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA}' \rangle \bullet : \underline{FA}$ (and dually for computations), the statement of the theorem wraps one cast with the constructors for U and F types (functoriality of F/U).

THEOREM 3.9 (CASTS ARE A GALOIS CONNECTION).

- (1) $\bullet' : \underline{FA}' \vdash \text{bind } x \leftarrow \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA}' \rangle \bullet'; \text{ret } (\langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x) \sqsubseteq \bullet' : \underline{FA}'$
- (2) $\bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA}' \rangle (\text{ret } (\langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x)) : \underline{FA}$
- (3) $x : \underline{UB}' \vdash \langle \underline{UB}' \leftarrow \underline{UB} \rangle (\text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \text{force } x)) \sqsubseteq x : \underline{UB}'$

(4) $x : \underline{UB} \vdash x \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } (\langle B \leftarrow B' \rangle (\text{force } (\langle \underline{UB}' \leftarrow \underline{UB} \rangle x))) : \underline{UB}$

PROOF.

(1) By η for F types, $\bullet' : \underline{FA}' \vdash \bullet' \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet'; \text{ret } x' : \underline{FA}'$, so it suffices to show

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA}' \rangle \bullet'; \text{ret } (\langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x) \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' : A' \leftarrow \bullet'; \text{ret } x'$$

By congruence, it suffices to show $\langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA}' \rangle \bullet' \sqsubseteq \bullet' : \underline{FA} \sqsubseteq \underline{FA}'$, which is true by downcast left, and $x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A' \vdash \text{ret } (\langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x) \sqsubseteq \text{ret } x' : A'$, which is true by congruence for ret, upcast left, and the assumption.

(2) By η for F types, it suffices to show

$\bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash \text{bind } \bullet \leftarrow x; \text{ret } x \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA}' \rangle (\text{ret } (\langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x)) : \underline{FA}$
so by congruence,

$$x : A \vdash \text{ret } x \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA}' \rangle (\text{ret } (\langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x))$$

By downcast right, it suffices to show

$$x : A \vdash \text{ret } x \sqsubseteq (\text{ret } (\langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x)) : \underline{FA} \sqsubseteq \underline{FA}'$$

and by congruence

$$x : A \vdash x \sqsubseteq ((\langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x)) : A \sqsubseteq A'$$

which is true by upcast right.

(3) By η for U types, it suffices to show

$$x : \underline{UB}' \vdash \langle \underline{UB}' \leftarrow \underline{UB} \rangle (\text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \text{force } x)) \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } (\text{force } x) : \underline{UB}'$$

By upcast left, it suffices to show

$$x : \underline{UB}' \vdash (\text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \text{force } x)) \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } (\text{force } x) : \underline{UB} \sqsubseteq \underline{UB}'$$

and by congruence

$$x : \underline{UB}' \vdash \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \text{force } x \sqsubseteq \text{force } x : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$$

which is true by downcast left.

(4) By η for U types, it suffices to show

$$x : \underline{UB} \vdash \text{thunk } (\text{force } x) \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle (\text{force } (\langle \underline{UB}' \leftarrow \underline{UB} \rangle x))) : \underline{UB}$$

and by congruence

$$x : \underline{UB} \vdash (\text{force } x) \sqsubseteq (\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle (\text{force } (\langle \underline{UB}' \leftarrow \underline{UB} \rangle x))) : \underline{B}$$

By downcast right, it suffices to show

$$x : \underline{UB} \vdash (\text{force } x) \sqsubseteq (\text{force } (\langle \underline{UB}' \leftarrow \underline{UB} \rangle x)) : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$$

and by congruence

$$x : \underline{UB} \vdash x \sqsubseteq (\langle \underline{UB}' \leftarrow \underline{UB} \rangle x) : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$$

which is true by upcast right.

□

The retract property says roughly that $x \sqsubseteq \langle T' \leftarrow T \rangle \langle T' \rightarrow T \rangle x$ (upcast then downcast does not change the behavior), strengthening the \sqsubseteq of Theorem 3.9. In Figure 5, we asserted the retract axiom for casts with the dynamic type. This and the composition property implies the retraction property for general casts:

THEOREM 3.10 (RETRACT PROPERTY FOR GENERAL CASTS).

- (1) $\bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA'} \rangle (\text{ret } (\langle A' \rightarrow A \rangle x)) \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{FA}$
- (2) $x : \underline{UB} \vdash \text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle (\text{force } (\langle \underline{UB'} \rightarrow \underline{UB} \rangle x))) \sqsubseteq x : \underline{UB}$

PROOF. We need only to show the \sqsubseteq direction, because the converse is Theorem 3.9.

- (1) Substituting $\text{ret } (\langle A' \rightarrow A \rangle x)$ into Theorem 3.9's

$$\bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA'} \rangle (\text{ret } (\langle A' \rightarrow A \rangle x)) : \underline{FA}$$

and β -reducing gives

$$x : A \vdash \text{ret } (\langle A' \rightarrow A \rangle x) \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{F?} \rangle (\text{ret } (\langle ? \rightarrow A' \rangle \langle A' \rightarrow A \rangle x))$$

Using this, after η -expanding $\bullet : \underline{FA}$ on the right and using congruence for bind, it suffices to derive as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA'} \rangle (\text{ret } (\langle A' \rightarrow A \rangle x)) & \sqsubseteq \text{congruence} \\ \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA'} \rangle \langle \underline{FA'} \leftarrow \underline{F?} \rangle (\text{ret } (\langle ? \rightarrow A' \rangle \langle A' \rightarrow A \rangle x)) & \sqsubseteq \text{composition} \\ \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{F?} \rangle (\text{ret } (\langle ? \rightarrow A \rangle x)) & \sqsubseteq \text{retract axiom for } \langle ? \rightarrow A \rangle \\ \text{ret } x & \end{array}$$

- (2) After using η for U and congruence, it suffices to show

$$x : \underline{UB} \vdash \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle (\text{force } (\langle \underline{UB'} \rightarrow \underline{UB} \rangle x)) \sqsubseteq \text{force } x : \underline{B}$$

Substituting $x : \underline{UB} \vdash \langle \underline{UB'} \rightarrow \underline{UB} \rangle x : \underline{UB'}$ into Theorem 3.9's

$$x : \underline{UB} \vdash x \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B'} \leftarrow \underline{i} \rangle (\text{force } (\langle \underline{U_i} \rightarrow \underline{UB'} \rangle x))) : \underline{UB'}$$

gives

$$x : \underline{UB} \vdash \langle \underline{UB'} \rightarrow \underline{UB} \rangle x \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B'} \leftarrow \underline{i} \rangle (\text{force } (\langle \underline{U_i} \rightarrow \underline{UB'} \rangle \langle \underline{UB'} \rightarrow \underline{UB} \rangle x))) : \underline{UB'}$$

So we have

$$\begin{array}{ll} \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle (\text{force } \langle \underline{UB'} \rightarrow \underline{UB} \rangle x) & \sqsubseteq \\ \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \text{force } (\text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B'} \leftarrow \underline{i} \rangle (\text{force } (\langle \underline{U_i} \rightarrow \underline{UB'} \rangle \langle \underline{UB'} \rightarrow \underline{UB} \rangle x)))) & \sqsubseteq \beta \\ \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle (\langle \underline{B'} \leftarrow \underline{i} \rangle (\text{force } (\langle \underline{U_i} \rightarrow \underline{UB'} \rangle \langle \underline{UB'} \rightarrow \underline{UB} \rangle x))) & \sqsubseteq \text{composition} \\ \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{i} \rangle (\text{force } (\langle \underline{U_i} \rightarrow \underline{UB} \rangle x)) & \sqsubseteq \text{retract axiom} \\ \text{ret } x & \sqsubseteq \text{composition} \end{array}$$

□

3.4 Unique Implementations of Casts

Definition 3.11. Let a *type constructor* C be a (value or computation) type that well-formed according to the grammar in Figure 1 with additional hypotheses X val type and \underline{Y} comp type standing for value or computation types, respectively. We write $C[A/X]$ and $C[\underline{B}/\underline{Y}]$ for the substitution of a type for a variable.

For example,

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 \text{ val type}, X_2 \text{ val type} &\vdash X_1 + X_2 \text{ val type} \\ \underline{Y} \text{ comp type} &\vdash U\underline{Y} \text{ val type} \\ X_1 \text{ val type}, X_2 \text{ val type} &\vdash \underline{F}(X_1 + X_2) \text{ comp type} \end{aligned}$$

are type constructors.

It is admissible that all type constructors are monotone in type dynamism, because we included a congruence rule for every type constructor in Figure 2:

LEMMA 3.12 (MONOTONICITY OF TYPE CONSTRUCTORS). *For any type constructor X val type $\vdash C$, if $A \sqsubseteq A'$ then $C[A/X] \sqsubseteq C[A'/x]$. For any type constructor \underline{Y} comp type $\vdash C$, if $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$ then $C[\underline{B}/\underline{Y}] \sqsubseteq C[\underline{B}'/\underline{Y}]$.*

PROOF. Induction on C . In the case for a variable X or \underline{Y} , $A \sqsubseteq A'$ or $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$ by assumption. In all other cases, the result follows from the inductive hypotheses and the congruence rule for type dynamism for the type constructor (Figure 2). For example, in the case for $+$, $A_1[A/x] \sqsubseteq A_1[A'/x]$ and $A_2[A/x] \sqsubseteq A_2[A'/x]$, so $A_1[A/x] + A_2[A/x] \sqsubseteq A_1[A'/x] + A_2[A'/x]$. \square

The following lemma helps show that a complex value $\langle\langle C[A'_i/X_i, \underline{B}'_i/\underline{Y}_i] \prec C[A_i/X_i, \underline{B}_i/\underline{Y}_i] \rangle\rangle$ is an upcast from $C[A_i/X_i, \underline{B}_i/\underline{Y}_i]$ to $C[A'_i/X_i, \underline{B}'_i/\underline{Y}_i]$.

LEMMA 3.13 (UPCAST LEMMA). *Let X_1 val type, \dots X_n val type, \underline{Y}_1 comp type, \dots \underline{Y}_n comp type. Let C val type be a value type constructor. We abbreviate the instantiation $C[A_1/X_1, \dots, A_n/X_n, \underline{B}_1/\underline{Y}_1, \dots, \underline{B}_m/\underline{Y}_m]$ by $C[A_i, \underline{B}_i]$.*

Suppose $\langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \prec C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle$ is a complex value (depending on C and each $A_i, A'_i, \underline{B}_i, \underline{B}'_i$) such that

- (1) *For all value types A_1, \dots, A_n and A'_1, \dots, A'_n with $A_i \sqsubseteq A'_i$, and all computation types $\underline{B}_1, \dots, \underline{B}_m$ and $\underline{B}'_1, \dots, \underline{B}'_m$ with $\underline{B}_i \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_i$,*

$$x : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \vdash \langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \prec C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle x : C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i]$$

- (2) *For all value types $A_i \sqsubseteq A'_i$ and computation types $\underline{B}_i \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_i$,*

$$x : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \vdash \langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \prec C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle x \sqsubseteq \langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \prec C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle x : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \sqsubseteq C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i]$$

$$x \sqsubseteq x' : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \sqsubseteq C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \vdash \langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \prec C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle x \sqsubseteq \langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \prec C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \rangle\rangle x' : C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i]$$

- (3) *For all value types A_1, \dots, A_n and all computation types $\underline{B}_1, \dots, \underline{B}_m$,*

$$x : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \vdash \langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \prec C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle x \sqsubseteq x : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i]$$

Then $\langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle$ satisfies the universal property of an upcast, so by Theorem 3.7

$$x : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \vdash \langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle x \sqsubseteq \langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle x : C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i]$$

Moreover, the left-to-right direction uses only the left-to-right direction of assumption (3), and the right-to-left uses only the right-to-left direction of assumption (3).

PROOF. First, we show that $\langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle$ satisfies the universal property of an upcast.

To show

$$x \sqsubseteq x' : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \sqsubseteq C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i] \vdash \langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle x \sqsubseteq x' : C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i]$$

assumption (2) part 2 gives

$$\langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle x \sqsubseteq \langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle x' : C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i]$$

Then transitivity with the left-to-right direction of assumption (3)

$$\langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle \langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle x \sqsubseteq \langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle x$$

gives the result.

To show

$$x \sqsubseteq \langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle x : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \sqsubseteq C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i]$$

By assumption (2) part 1, we have

$$\langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle x \sqsubseteq \langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \sqsubseteq C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i]$$

so transitivity with the right-to-left direction of assumption (3) gives the result:

$$x \sqsubseteq \langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle x$$

Then Theorem 3.7 implies that $\langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle$ is equivalent to $\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle$. \square

Dually, we have

LEMMA 3.14 (DOWNCAST LEMMA). Let X_1 val type, \dots X_n val type, \underline{Y}_1 comp type, \dots \underline{Y}_n comp type be a computation type constructor. We abbreviate the instantiation $C[A_1/X_1, \dots, A_n/X_n, \underline{B}_1/\underline{Y}_1, \dots, \underline{B}_m/\underline{Y}_m]$ by $C[A_i, \underline{B}_i]$.

Suppose $\langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \rangle\rangle -$ is a complex stack (depending on C and each $A_i, A'_i, \underline{B}_i, \underline{B}'_i$) such that

- (1) For all value types A_1, \dots, A_n and A'_1, \dots, A'_n with $A_i \sqsubseteq A'_i$, and all computation types $\underline{B}_1, \dots, \underline{B}_m$ and $\underline{B}'_1, \dots, \underline{B}'_n$ with $\underline{B}_i \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_i$,

$$\bullet : C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \vdash \langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \multimap C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \rangle\rangle \bullet : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i]$$

(2) For all value types $A_i \sqsubseteq A'_i$ and computation types $\underline{B}_i \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \bullet : C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \vdash \langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \leftarrow C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \rangle\rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \leftarrow C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \rangle\rangle \bullet : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \sqsubseteq C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \\ & \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \sqsubseteq C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \vdash \langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \leftarrow C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle x \sqsubseteq \langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \leftarrow C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \rangle\rangle x' : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \end{aligned}$$

(3) For all value types A_1, \dots, A_n and all computation types $\underline{B}_1, \dots, \underline{B}_m$,

$$\bullet : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \vdash \langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \leftarrow C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i]$$

Then $\langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \leftarrow C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \rangle\rangle$ satisfies the universal property of a downcast, so by Theorem 3.7

$$\bullet : C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \vdash \langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \leftarrow C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \rangle\rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \leftarrow C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \rangle \bullet : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i]$$

Moreover, the left-to-right direction uses only the left-to-right direction of assumption (3), and the right-to-left uses only the right-to-left direction of assumption (3).

PROOF. First, we show that $\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \leftarrow C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \rangle$ satisfies the universal property of a downcast, and then apply Theorem 3.7. To show

$$\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet' : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \sqsubseteq C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \leftarrow C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \rangle\rangle \bullet' : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i]$$

assumption (2) part 2 gives

$$\langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \leftarrow C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \leftarrow C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \rangle\rangle \bullet'$$

Then transitivity with the right-to-left direction of assumption (3)

$$\bullet \sqsubseteq \langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \leftarrow C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \rangle\rangle \bullet$$

gives the result.

To show

$$\langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \leftarrow C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \rangle\rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \sqsubseteq C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i]$$

by assumption (2) part 1, we have

$$\langle\langle C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \leftarrow C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \rangle\rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \leftarrow C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \rangle\rangle \bullet : C[A_i, \underline{B}_i] \sqsubseteq C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i]$$

so transitivity with the left-to-right direction of assumption (3)

$$\langle\langle C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \leftarrow C[A'_i, \underline{B}'_i] \rangle\rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet$$

gives the result. □

Together, the universal property for casts and the η principles for each type imply that the casts must behave as in lazy cast semantics:

THEOREM 3.15 (CAST UNIQUE IMPLEMENTATION THEOREM FOR $+$, \times , \rightarrow , $\&$). *The casts' behavior is uniquely determined as follows:*

$$\langle A'_1 + A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_1 + A_2 \rangle s \sqsubseteq \text{case } s \{ x_1.\text{inl } (\langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle x_1) \mid x_2.\text{inr } (\langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle x_2) \}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \underline{F}(A'_1 + A'_2) \llcorner \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2) \rangle \bullet &\sqsubseteq \text{bind } (s : (A'_1 + A'_2)) \leftarrow \bullet; \text{case } s \\ &\{ x'_1.\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow (\langle \underline{F}A_1 \llcorner \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle (\text{ret } x'_1)); \text{ret } (\text{inl } x_1) \\ &\mid x'_2.\text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow (\langle \underline{F}A_2 \llcorner \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle (\text{ret } x'_2)); \text{ret } (\text{inr } x_2) \} \end{aligned}$$

$$\langle A'_1 \times A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_1 \times A_2 \rangle p \sqsubseteq \text{split } p \text{ to } (x_1, x_2). (\langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle x_1, \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle x_2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \underline{F}(A'_1 \times A'_2) \llcorner \underline{F}(A_1 \times A_2) \rangle \bullet &\sqsubseteq \text{bind } p' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } p' \text{ to } (x'_1, x'_2). \\ &\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A_1 \llcorner \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \text{ret } x'_1; \\ &\text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A_2 \llcorner \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \text{ret } x'_2; \text{ret } (x_1, x_2) \\ &\sqsubseteq \text{bind } p' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } p' \text{ to } (x'_1, x'_2). \\ &\text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A_2 \llcorner \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \text{ret } x'_2; \\ &\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A_1 \llcorner \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \text{ret } x'_1; \text{ret } (x_1, x_2) \end{aligned}$$

$$\langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \llcorner \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \{ \pi \mapsto \langle \underline{B}_1 \llcorner \underline{B}'_1 \rangle \pi \bullet \mid \pi' \mapsto \langle \underline{B}_2 \llcorner \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \pi' \bullet \}$$

$$\langle U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \hookrightarrow U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \rangle p \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \{ \pi \mapsto \text{force } (\langle U\underline{B}'_1 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_1 \rangle (\text{thunk } \pi(\text{force } p))) \\ \pi' \mapsto \text{force } (\langle U\underline{B}'_2 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_2 \rangle (\text{thunk } \pi'(\text{force } p))) \}$$

$$\langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \llcorner A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \lambda x. \langle \underline{B} \llcorner \underline{B}' \rangle (\bullet (\langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x))$$

$$\langle U(A' \rightarrow \underline{B}') \hookrightarrow U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \rangle f \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } (\lambda x'. \text{bind } x \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A \llcorner \underline{F}A' \rangle (\text{ret } x'); \\ \text{force } (\langle U\underline{B}' \hookrightarrow U\underline{B} \rangle (\text{thunk } (\text{force } (f) x))))$$

In the case for an eager product \times , we can actually also show that reversing the order and running $\langle \underline{F}A_2 \llcorner \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \text{ret } x'_2$ and then $\langle \underline{F}A_1 \llcorner \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \text{ret } x'_1$ is also an implementation of this cast, and therefore equal to the above. Intuitively, this is sensible because the only effect a downcast introduces is a run-time error, and if either downcast errors, both possible implementations will.

PROOF.

- (1) Sums upcast. We use Lemma 3.13 with the type constructor X_1 val type, X_2 val type $\vdash X_1 + X_2$ val type. Suppose $A_1 \sqsubseteq A'_1$ and $A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_2$ and let

$$s : A_1 + A_2 \vdash \langle \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rangle s : A'_1 + A'_2$$

stand for

$$\text{case } s\{x_1.\text{inl } (\langle A'_1 \rightsquigarrow A_1 \rangle x_1) \mid x_2.\text{inr } (\langle A'_2 \rightsquigarrow A_2 \rangle x_2)\}$$

which has the type required for the lemma's assumption (1).

Assumption (2) requires two condition, both of which are proved by the congruence rules for case, inl, inr, and upcasts. The first,

$$s : A_1 + A_2 \vdash \langle A_1 + A_2 \rightsquigarrow A_1 + A_2 \rangle s \sqsubseteq \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \rightsquigarrow A_1 + A_2 \rangle s : A_1 + A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_1 + A'_2$$

expands to

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{case } s\{x_1.\text{inl } (\langle A_1 \rightsquigarrow A_1 \rangle x_1) \mid x_2.\text{inr } (\langle A_2 \rightsquigarrow A_2 \rangle x_2)\} \\ & \quad \sqsubseteq \\ & \text{case } s\{x_1.\text{inl } (\langle A'_1 \rightsquigarrow A_1 \rangle x_1) \mid x_2.\text{inr } (\langle A'_2 \rightsquigarrow A_2 \rangle x_2)\} \end{aligned}$$

The second,

$$s \sqsubseteq s' : A_1 + A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_1 + A'_2 \vdash \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \rightsquigarrow A_1 + A_2 \rangle s \sqsubseteq \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \rightsquigarrow A'_1 + A'_2 \rangle s' : A'_1 + A'_2$$

expands to

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{case } s\{x_1.\text{inl } (\langle A'_1 \rightsquigarrow A_1 \rangle x_1) \mid x_2.\text{inr } (\langle A'_2 \rightsquigarrow A_2 \rangle x_2)\} \\ & \quad \sqsubseteq \\ & \text{case } s'\{x_1.\text{inl } (\langle A'_1 \rightsquigarrow A'_1 \rangle x'_1) \mid x_2.\text{inr } (\langle A'_2 \rightsquigarrow A'_2 \rangle x'_2)\} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for assumption (3), we need to show

$$\text{case } s\{x_1.\text{inl } (\langle A_1 \rightsquigarrow A_1 \rangle x_1) \mid x_2.\text{inr } (\langle A_2 \rightsquigarrow A_2 \rangle x_2)\} \sqsupseteq s$$

which is true because $\langle A_1 \rightsquigarrow A_1 \rangle$ and $\langle A_2 \rightsquigarrow A_2 \rangle$ are the identity, and using “weak η ” for sums, $\text{case } s\{x_1.\text{inl } x_1 \mid x_2.\text{inr } x_2\} \sqsupseteq x$, which is the special case of the η rule in Figure 5 for the identity complex value:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{case } s\{x_1.\text{inl } (\langle A_1 \rightsquigarrow A_1 \rangle x_1) \mid x_2.\text{inr } (\langle A_2 \rightsquigarrow A_2 \rangle x_2)\} & \sqsupseteq \\ \text{case } s\{x_1.\text{inl } (x_1) \mid x_2.\text{inr } (x_2)\} & \sqsupseteq \\ s & \end{aligned}$$

- (2) Sums downcast. We use the downcast lemma with X_1 val type, X_2 val type $\vdash \underline{F}(X_1 + X_2)$ comp type. Let

$$\bullet' : \underline{F}(A'_1 + A'_2) \vdash \langle \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 + A'_2) \rangle \bullet' : \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2)$$

stand for

$$\text{bind } (s : (A'_1 + A'_2)) \leftarrow \bullet; \text{case } s\{x'_1.\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow (\langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle (\text{ret } x'_1)); \text{ret } (\text{inl } x_1) \mid \dots$$

(where, as in the theorem statement, inr branch is analogous), which has the correct type for the lemma's assumption (1).

For assumption (2), we first need to show

$$\bullet : \underline{F}(A'_1 + A'_2) \vdash \langle \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 + A'_2) \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{F}(A'_1 + A'_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 + A'_2) \rangle \bullet' : \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2) \sqsubseteq \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2)$$

i.e.

$$\text{bind } (s' : (A'_1 + A'_2)) \leftarrow \bullet; \text{case } s'\{x'_1.\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow (\langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle(\text{ret } x'_1)); \text{ret } (\text{inl } x_1) \mid \dots\}$$

$$\sqsubseteq$$

$$\text{bind } (s' : (A'_1 + A'_2)) \leftarrow \bullet; \text{case } s'\{x'_1.\text{bind } x'_1 \leftarrow (\langle \underline{F}A'_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle(\text{ret } x'_1)); \text{ret } (\text{inl } x'_1) \mid \dots\}$$

which is true by the congruence rules for bind, case, downcasts, ret, and inl/inr.

Next, we need to show

$$\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet' : \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2) \sqsubseteq \underline{F}(A'_1 + A'_2) \vdash \langle \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2) \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 + A'_2) \rangle \bullet' :$$

i.e.

$$\text{bind } (s : (A_1 + A_2)) \leftarrow \bullet; \text{case } s\{x_1.\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow (\langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A_1 \rangle(\text{ret } x_1)); \text{ret } (\text{inl } x_1) \mid \dots\}$$

$$\sqsubseteq$$

$$\text{bind } (s' : (A'_1 + A'_2)) \leftarrow \bullet; \text{case } s'\{x'_1.\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow (\langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle(\text{ret } x'_1)); \text{ret } (\text{inl } x_1) \mid \dots\}$$

which is also true by congruence.

Finally, for assumption (3), we show

$$\text{bind } (s : (A_1 + A_2)) \leftarrow \bullet; \text{case } s\{x_1.\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow (\langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A_1 \rangle(\text{ret } x_1)); \text{ret } (\text{inl } x_1) \mid \dots\} \sqsubseteq \text{bind } (s : (A_1 + A_2)) \leftarrow \bullet; \text{case } s\{x_1.\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow ((\text{ret } x_1)); \text{ret } (\text{inl } x_1) \mid \dots\} \sqsubseteq \text{bind } (s : (A_1 + A_2)) \leftarrow \bullet; \text{case } s\{x_1.\text{ret } (\text{inl } x_1) \mid x_2.\text{ret } (\text{inr } x_2)\} \sqsubseteq \text{bind } (s : (A_1 + A_2)) \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } s$$

$$\bullet$$

$$\bullet$$

$$\bullet$$

$$\bullet$$

using the downcast identity, β for \underline{F} types, η for sums, and η for \underline{F} types.

- (3) Eager product upcast. We use Lemma 3.13 with the type constructor $X_1 \text{ val type}, X_2 \text{ val type}$ $X_1 \times X_2 \text{ val type}$. Let

$$p : A_1 \times A_2 \vdash \langle \langle A'_1 \times A'_2 \leftarrow A_1 \times A_2 \rangle \rangle s : A'_1 \times A'_2$$

stand for

$$\text{split } p \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).(\langle A'_1 \leftarrow A_1 \rangle x_1, \langle A'_2 \leftarrow A_2 \rangle x_2)$$

which has the type required for the lemma's assumption (1).

Assumption (2) requires two condition, both of which are proved by the congruence rules for split, pairing, and upcasts. The first,

$$p : A_1 \times A_2 \vdash \langle \langle A_1 \times A_2 \leftarrow A_1 \times A_2 \rangle \rangle s \sqsubseteq \langle \langle A'_1 \times A'_2 \leftarrow A_1 \times A_2 \rangle \rangle s : A_1 \times A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_1 \times A'_2$$

expands to

$$\text{split } p \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).(\langle A_1 \leftarrow A_1 \rangle x_1, \langle A_2 \leftarrow A_2 \rangle x_2)$$

$$\sqsubseteq$$

$$\text{split } p \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).(\langle A'_1 \leftarrow A_1 \rangle x_1, \langle A'_2 \leftarrow A_2 \rangle x_2)$$

The second,

$$p \sqsubseteq p' : A_1 \times A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_1 \times A'_2 \vdash \langle \langle A'_1 \times A'_2 \leftarrow A_1 \times A_2 \rangle \rangle s \sqsubseteq \langle \langle A'_1 \times A'_2 \leftarrow A'_1 \times A'_2 \rangle \rangle s' : A'_1 \times A'_2$$

expands to

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{split } p \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).(\langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle x_1, \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle x_2) \\ & \quad \sqsubseteq \\ & \text{split } p' \text{ to } (x'_1, x'_2).(\langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A'_1 \rangle x'_1, \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A'_2 \rangle x'_2) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for assumption (3), using η for products and the fact that $\langle A \hookrightarrow A \rangle$ is the identity, we have

$$\text{split } p \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).(\langle A_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle x_1, \langle A_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle x_2) \sqsubseteq \text{split } p \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).(x_1, x_2) \sqsubseteq p$$

(4) Eager product downcast.

We use the downcast lemma with X_1 val type, X_2 val type $\vdash \underline{F}(X_1 \times X_2)$ comp type.

Let

$$\bullet' : \underline{F}(A'_1 \times A'_2) \vdash \langle \underline{F}(A_1 \times A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 \times A'_2) \rangle \bullet' : \underline{F}(A_1 \times A_2)$$

stand for

$$\text{bind } p' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } p' \text{ to } (x'_1, x'_2). \text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \text{ret } x'_1; \text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A_2 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \text{ret } x'_2$$

which has the correct type for the lemma's assumption (1).

For assumption (2), we first need to show

$$\bullet : \underline{F}(A'_1 \times A'_2) \vdash \langle \underline{F}(A_1 \times A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 \times A'_2) \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{F}(A'_1 \times A'_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 \times A'_2) \rangle \bullet' : \underline{F}(A_1 \times A_2) \sqsubseteq \underline{F}(A_1 \times A_2)$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{bind } p' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } p' \text{ to } (x'_1, x'_2). \text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \text{ret } x'_1; \text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A_2 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \text{ret } x'_2 \\ & \quad \sqsubseteq \\ & \text{bind } p' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } p' \text{ to } (x'_1, x'_2). \text{bind } x'_1 \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A'_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \text{ret } x'_1; \text{bind } x'_2 \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A'_2 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \text{ret } x'_2 \end{aligned}$$

which is true by the congruence rules for bind, split, downcasts, ret, and pairing.

Next, we need to show

$$\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet' : \underline{F}(A_1 \times A_2) \sqsubseteq \underline{F}(A'_1 \times A'_2) \vdash \langle \underline{F}(A_1 \times A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A_1 \times A_2) \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{F}(A_1 \times A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 \times A'_2) \rangle \bullet' :$$

i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{bind } p \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } p \text{ to } (x_1, x_2). \text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A_1 \rangle \text{ret } x_1; \text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A_2 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \text{ret } x_1 \\ & \quad \sqsubseteq \\ & \text{bind } p' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } p' \text{ to } (x'_1, x'_2). \text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \text{ret } x'_1; \text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A_2 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \text{ret } x'_2 \end{aligned}$$

which is also true by congruence.

Finally, for assumption (3), we show

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{bind } p \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } p \text{ to } (x_1, x_2). \text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A_1 \rangle \text{ret } x_1; \text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A_2 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \text{ret } x_2 \\ & \text{bind } p \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } p \text{ to } (x_1, x_2). \text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \text{ret } x_1; \text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow \text{ret } x_2; \text{ret } (x_1, x_2) \\ & \text{bind } p \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } p \text{ to } (x_1, x_2). \text{ret } (x_1, x_2) \\ & \text{bind } p \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } p \end{aligned}$$

•

using the downcast identity, β for \underline{F} types, η for eager products, and η for \underline{F} types.

An analogous argument works if we sequence the downcasts of the components in the opposite order:

bind $p' \leftarrow \bullet$; split p' to (x'_1, x'_2) . bind $x_2 \leftarrow \langle \underline{FA}_2 \leftarrow \underline{FA}'_2 \rangle \text{ret } x'_2$; bind $x_1 \leftarrow \langle \underline{FA}_1 \leftarrow \underline{FA}'_1 \rangle \text{ret } x'_1$

(the only facts about downcasts used above are congruence and the downcast identity), which shows that these two implementations of the downcast are themselves equidynamic.

- (5) Lazy product downcast. We use Lemma 3.14 with the type constructor \underline{Y}_1 comp type, \underline{Y}_2 $\underline{Y}_1 \& \underline{Y}_2$ val type. Let

$$\bullet' : \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \vdash \langle \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rangle \bullet' : \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2$$

stand for

$$\{\pi \mapsto \langle \underline{B}_1 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \rangle \pi \bullet' \mid \pi' \mapsto \langle \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \pi' \bullet'\}$$

which has the type required for the lemma's assumption (1).

Assumption (2) requires two conditions, both of which are proved by the congruence rules for pairing, projection, and downcasts. The first,

$$\bullet' : \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \vdash \langle \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rangle \bullet' \sqsubseteq \langle \langle \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rangle \bullet' : \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2$$

expands to

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\pi \mapsto \langle \underline{B}_1 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \rangle \pi \bullet' \mid \pi' \mapsto \langle \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \pi' \bullet'\} \\ & \quad \sqsubseteq \\ & \{\pi \mapsto \langle \underline{B}'_1 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \rangle \pi \bullet' \mid \pi' \mapsto \langle \underline{B}'_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \pi' \bullet'\} \end{aligned}$$

The second,

$$\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet' : \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \vdash \langle \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \rangle \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rangle \bullet' : \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2$$

expands to

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\pi \mapsto \langle \underline{B}_1 \leftarrow \underline{B}_1 \rangle \pi \bullet \mid \pi' \mapsto \langle \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}_2 \rangle \pi' \bullet\} \\ & \quad \sqsubseteq \\ & \{\pi \mapsto \langle \underline{B}_1 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \rangle \pi \bullet' \mid \pi' \mapsto \langle \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \pi' \bullet'\} \end{aligned}$$

For assumption (3), we have, using $\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle$ is the identity and η for $\&$,

$$\{\pi \mapsto \langle \underline{B}_1 \leftarrow \underline{B}_1 \rangle \pi \bullet \mid \pi' \mapsto \langle \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}_2 \rangle \pi' \bullet\} \sqsupseteq \{\pi \mapsto \pi \bullet \mid \pi' \mapsto \pi' \bullet\} \sqsupseteq \bullet$$

- (6) Lazy product upcast.

We use Lemma 3.13 with the type constructor \underline{Y}_1 comp type, \underline{Y}_2 comp type $\vdash U(\underline{Y}_1 \& \underline{Y}_2)$ val type. Let

$$p : U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \vdash \langle \langle U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \leftarrow U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \rangle \rangle p : U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2)$$

stand for

$$\text{thunk } \{\pi \mapsto \text{force } (\langle \underline{UB}'_1 \leftarrow \underline{UB}_1 \rangle (\text{thunk } \pi(\text{force } p))) \mid \pi' \mapsto \text{force } (\langle \underline{UB}'_2 \leftarrow \underline{UB}_2 \rangle (\text{thunk } \pi'(\text{force } p)))\}$$

which has the type required for the lemma's assumption (1).

Assumption (2) requires two conditions, both of which are proved by the congruence rules for thunk, force, pairing, projections, and upcasts. The first,

$p : U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \vdash \langle U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \hookrightarrow U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \rangle p \sqsubseteq \langle U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \hookrightarrow U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \rangle p : U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \sqsubseteq U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2)$
expands to

$\text{thunk } \{\pi \mapsto \text{force } (\langle U\underline{B}_1 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_1 \rangle (\text{thunk } \pi(\text{force } p))) \mid \pi' \mapsto \text{force } (\langle U\underline{B}_2 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_2 \rangle (\text{thunk } \pi'(\text{force } p)))\} \sqsubseteq$
 $\text{thunk } \{\pi \mapsto \text{force } (\langle U\underline{B}'_1 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_1 \rangle (\text{thunk } \pi(\text{force } p))) \mid \pi' \mapsto \text{force } (\langle U\underline{B}'_2 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_2 \rangle (\text{thunk } \pi'(\text{force } p)))\}$

The second,

$p \sqsubseteq p' : U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \sqsubseteq U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \vdash \langle U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \hookrightarrow U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \rangle p \sqsubseteq \langle U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \hookrightarrow U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \rangle p :$
expands to

$\text{thunk } \{\pi \mapsto \text{force } (\langle U\underline{B}'_1 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_1 \rangle (\text{thunk } \pi(\text{force } p))) \mid \pi' \mapsto \text{force } (\langle U\underline{B}'_2 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_2 \rangle (\text{thunk } \pi'(\text{force } p)))\} \sqsubseteq$
 $\text{thunk } \{\pi \mapsto \text{force } (\langle U\underline{B}'_1 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}'_1 \rangle (\text{thunk } \pi(\text{force } p'))) \mid \pi' \mapsto \text{force } (\langle U\underline{B}'_2 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}'_2 \rangle (\text{thunk } \pi'(\text{force } p')))\}$

Finally, for assumption (3), using η for *times*, β and η for *U* types, and the fact that $\langle A \hookrightarrow A \rangle$ is the identity, we have

$\text{thunk } \{\pi \mapsto \text{force } (\langle U\underline{B}_1 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_1 \rangle (\text{thunk } \pi(\text{force } p))) \mid \pi' \mapsto \text{force } (\langle U\underline{B}_2 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_2 \rangle (\text{thunk } \pi'(\text{force } p)))\} \sqsubseteq$
 $\text{thunk } \{\pi \mapsto \text{force } (\text{thunk } \pi(\text{force } p)) \mid \pi' \mapsto \text{force } (\text{thunk } \pi'(\text{force } p))\} \sqsubseteq$
 $\text{thunk } \{\pi \mapsto \pi(\text{force } p) \mid \pi' \mapsto \pi'(\text{force } p)\}$

(7) Function downcast.

We use Lemma 3.14 with the type constructor X val type, \underline{Y} comp type $\vdash X \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ comp type. Let

$$\bullet' : A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \vdash \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \bullet' : A \rightarrow \underline{B}$$

stand for

$$\lambda x. \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle (\bullet (\langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x))$$

which has the type required for the lemma's assumption (1).

Assumption (2) requires two conditions, both of which are proved by the congruence rules for λ , application, upcasts, and downcasts. The first,

$\bullet' : A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \vdash \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \bullet' \sqsubseteq \langle A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \bullet' : A \rightarrow \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{A}' \rightarrow \underline{B}'$
expands to

$$\lambda x. \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle (\bullet (\langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x)) \sqsubseteq$$

$$\lambda x'. \langle \underline{B}' \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle (\bullet (\langle A' \hookrightarrow A' \rangle x'))$$

The second,

$\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet' : \underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{A}' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \vdash \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A \rightarrow \underline{B} \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \bullet' : A \rightarrow \underline{B}$

expands to

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda x. \langle \underline{B} \Leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle (\bullet (\langle A \Leftarrow A \rangle x)) \\ & \quad \sqsubseteq \\ & \lambda x. \langle \underline{B} \Leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle (\bullet (\langle A' \Leftarrow A \rangle x)) \end{aligned}$$

For assumption (3), we have, using $\langle A \Leftarrow A \rangle$ and $\langle \underline{B} \Leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle$ are the identity and η for \rightarrow ,

$$\lambda x. \langle \underline{B} \Leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle (\bullet (\langle A \Leftarrow A \rangle x)) \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \lambda x. (\bullet (x)) \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \bullet$$

(8) Function upcast.

We use Lemma 3.13 with the type constructor \underline{X} val type, \underline{Y} comp type $\vdash U(\underline{X} \rightarrow \underline{Y})$ val type. Suppose $A \sqsubseteq A'$ as value types and $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$ as computation types and let

$$p : U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \vdash \langle U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \Leftarrow U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \rangle p : U(A' \rightarrow \underline{B}')$$

stand for

thunk $(\lambda x'. \text{bind } x \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A \Leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle (\text{ret } x'); \text{force } (\langle \underline{U}\underline{B}' \Leftarrow \underline{U}\underline{B} \rangle (\text{thunk } (\text{force } (f) x))))$

which has the type required for the lemma's assumption (1).

Assumption (2) requires two conditions, both of which are proved by the congruence rules for thunk, force, functions, application, upcasts, and downcasts.

The first,

$$f : U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \vdash \langle U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \Leftarrow U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \rangle f \sqsubseteq \langle U(A' \rightarrow \underline{B}') \Leftarrow U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \rangle f : U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \sqsubseteq U(A' \rightarrow \underline{B}')$$

expands to

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{thunk } (\lambda x. \text{bind } x \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A \Leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle (\text{ret } x); \text{force } (\langle \underline{U}\underline{B} \Leftarrow \underline{U}\underline{B}' \rangle (\text{thunk } (\text{force } (f) x)))) \\ & \quad \sqsubseteq \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{thunk } (\lambda x'. \text{bind } x \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A \Leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle (\text{ret } x'); \text{force } (\langle \underline{U}\underline{B}' \Leftarrow \underline{U}\underline{B} \rangle (\text{thunk } (\text{force } (f) x))))$$

The second,

$$f \sqsubseteq f' : U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \sqsubseteq U(A' \rightarrow \underline{B}') \vdash \langle U(A' \rightarrow \underline{B}') \Leftarrow U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \rangle f \sqsubseteq \langle U(A' \rightarrow \underline{B}') \Leftarrow U(A' \rightarrow \underline{B}') \rangle f'$$

expands to

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{thunk } (\lambda x'. \text{bind } x \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A \Leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle (\text{ret } x'); \text{force } (\langle \underline{U}\underline{B}' \Leftarrow \underline{U}\underline{B} \rangle (\text{thunk } (\text{force } (f) x)))) \\ & \quad \sqsubseteq \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{thunk } (\lambda x'. \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A' \Leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle (\text{ret } x'); \text{force } (\langle \underline{U}\underline{B}' \Leftarrow \underline{U}\underline{B}' \rangle (\text{thunk } (\text{force } (f') x'))))$$

Finally, for assumption (3), using η for \rightarrow , β for F types and β/η for U types, and the fact that $\langle \underline{B} \Leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle$ and $\langle A \Leftarrow A \rangle$ are the identity, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{thunk } (\lambda x. \text{bind } x \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A \Leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle (\text{ret } x); \text{force } (\langle \underline{U}\underline{B} \Leftarrow \underline{U}\underline{B}' \rangle (\text{thunk } (\text{force } (f) x)))) & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \\ \text{thunk } (\lambda x. \text{bind } x \leftarrow (\text{ret } x); \text{force } (\text{thunk } (\text{force } (f) x))) & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \\ \text{thunk } (\lambda x. \text{force } (\text{thunk } (\text{force } (f) x))) & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \\ \text{thunk } (\lambda x. (\text{force } (f) x)) & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \\ \text{thunk } (\text{force } (f)) & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \\ f & \end{aligned}$$

- (9) $z : 0 \vdash \langle A \leftarrow 0 \rangle z \sqsubseteq \text{absurd } z : A$ is immediate by η for 0 on the map $z : 0 \vdash \langle A \leftarrow 0 \rangle z : A$.

□

In GTT, we assert the existence of value upcasts and computation downcasts for derivable type dynamism relations. While we do not assert the existence of all *value* downcasts and *computation* upcasts, we can define the universal property that identifies a term as such:

Definition 3.16 (Stack upcasts/value downcasts).

- (1) If $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$, a *stack upcast from B to B'* is a stack $\bullet : \underline{B} \vdash \langle \underline{B}' \leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle \bullet : \underline{B}'$ that satisfies the computation dynamism rules of an upcast $\bullet : \underline{B} \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{B}' \leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle \bullet : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$ and $\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}' \vdash \langle \underline{B}' \leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet' : \underline{B}'$.
- (2) If $A \sqsubseteq A'$, a *value downcast from A' to A* is a complex value $x : A' \vdash \langle \langle A \leftarrow A' \rangle \rangle x : A$ that satisfies the value dynamism rules of a downcast $x : A' \vdash \langle \langle A \leftarrow A' \rangle \rangle x \sqsubseteq x : A \sqsubseteq A'$ and $x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A' \vdash x \sqsubseteq \langle \langle A \leftarrow A' \rangle \rangle x' : A$.

Because the proofs of Lemma 3.5, Lemma 3.6, Theorem 3.8, Theorem 3.7 rely only on the axioms for upcasts/downcasts, the analogues of these theorems hold for stack upcasts and value downcasts as well. Some value downcasts and computation upcasts do exist, leading to a characterization of the casts for the monad \underline{UFA} and comonad \underline{FUB} of $F \dashv U$:

THEOREM 3.17 (CAST UNIQUE IMPLEMENTATION THEOREM FOR \underline{UF} , \underline{FU}). *Let $A \sqsubseteq A'$ and $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$.*

- (1) $\bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash \text{bind } x : A \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } (\langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x) : \underline{FA}'$ is a stack upcast.
- (2) If $\langle \underline{B}' \leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle$ is a stack upcast, then $x : \underline{UB} \vdash \langle \underline{UB}' \leftarrow \underline{UB} \rangle x \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B}' \leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle (\text{force } x)) : \underline{UB}'$
- (3) $x : \underline{UB}' \vdash \text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle (\text{force } x)) : \underline{UB}$ is a value downcast.
- (4) If $\langle \langle A \leftarrow A' \rangle \rangle$ is a value downcast, then $\bullet : \underline{FA}' \vdash \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA}' \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' : A' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } (\langle A \leftarrow A' \rangle x)$
- (5) $x : \underline{UFA} \vdash \langle \underline{UFA}' \leftarrow \underline{UFA} \rangle x \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } (\text{bind } x : A \leftarrow \text{force } x; \text{ret } (\langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x))$
- $\bullet : \underline{FUB}' \vdash \langle \underline{FUB} \leftarrow \underline{FUB}' \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' : \underline{UB}' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } (\text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle (\text{force } x)))$

PROOF.

- (1) To show

$$\bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x : A \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } (\langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x) : \underline{FA} \sqsubseteq \underline{FA}'$$

we can η -expand $\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet$ bind $x \leftarrow \bullet$; ret x on the left, at which point by congruence it suffices to show $x \sqsubseteq \langle A' \multimap A \rangle x$, which is true up upcast right. To show

$$\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet' : \underline{FA} \sqsubseteq \underline{FA'} \vdash \text{bind } x : A \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } (\langle A' \multimap A \rangle x) \sqsubseteq \bullet' : \underline{FA'}$$

we can η -expand $\bullet' \sqsubseteq \bullet'$ bind $x' \leftarrow \bullet'$; ret x' on the right, and then apply congruence, the assumption that $\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet'$, and upcast left.

(2) We apply the upcast lemma with the type constructor \underline{Y} comp type $\vdash \underline{UY}$ val type.

The term $\text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B'} \multimap \underline{B} \rangle (\text{force } x))$ has the correct type for assumption

(1). For assumption (2), we show

$$x : \underline{UB} \vdash \text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B} \multimap \underline{B} \rangle (\text{force } x)) \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B'} \multimap \underline{B} \rangle (\text{force } x)) : \underline{UB} \sqsubseteq \underline{UB'}$$

by congruence for thunk , $\langle \underline{B} \multimap \underline{B} \rangle$ (proved analogously to Lemma 3.6), and force . We show

$$x \sqsubseteq x' : \underline{UB} \sqsubseteq \underline{UB'} \vdash \text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B} \multimap \underline{B} \rangle (\text{force } x)) \text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B'} \multimap \underline{B} \rangle (\text{force } x')) : \underline{UB}$$

by congruence as well. Finally, for assumption (3), we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B} \multimap \underline{B} \rangle (\text{force } x)) & \sqsubseteq & \\ \text{thunk } ((\text{force } x)) & \sqsubseteq & \\ x & & \end{array}$$

using η for U types and the identity principle for $\langle \underline{B} \multimap \underline{B} \rangle$ (proved analogously to Theorem 3.8).

(3) To show

$$x' : \underline{UB'} \vdash \text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B} \multimap \underline{B'} \rangle (\text{force } x')) \sqsubseteq x' : \underline{UB} \sqsubseteq \underline{UB'}$$

we can η -expand x' to $\text{thunk force } x'$, and then by congruence it suffices to show $\langle \underline{B} \multimap \underline{B'} \rangle (\text{force } x') \sqsubseteq \text{force } x' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}$, which is downcast left. Conversely, for

$$x \sqsubseteq x' : \underline{UB} \sqsubseteq \underline{UB'} \vdash x \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } (\langle \underline{B} \multimap \underline{B'} \rangle (\text{force } x')) : \underline{UB}$$

we η -expand x to $\text{thunk } (\text{force } x)$, and then it suffices to show $\langle \underline{B} \multimap \underline{B'} \rangle (\text{force } x) \sqsubseteq \text{force } x'$, which is true by downcast right and congruence of force on the assumption $x \sqsubseteq x'$.

(4) We use the downcast lemma with X val type $\vdash \underline{FX}$ comp type, where bind $x' : A' \leftarrow \bullet$; ret $(\langle A \multimap A' \rangle x)$ has the correct type for assumption (1). For assumption (2), we show

$$\bullet : \underline{FA'} \vdash \text{bind } x' : A' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } (\langle A \multimap A' \rangle x) \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' : A' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } (\langle A' \multimap A' \rangle \bullet)$$

by congruence for bind , ret , and $\langle A' \multimap A' \rangle$ (which is proved analogously to Lemma 3.6). We also show

$$\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet' : \underline{FA} \sqsubseteq \underline{FA'} \vdash \text{bind } x : A \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } (\langle A \multimap A \rangle x) \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' : A' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } (\langle A \multimap A' \rangle \bullet)$$

by congruence. Finally, for assumption (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{bind } x : A \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } (\langle\langle A \leftarrow A \rangle\rangle x) &\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \\ \text{bind } x : A \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } (x) &\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \\ &\bullet \end{aligned}$$

using the identity principle for $\langle\langle A \leftarrow A \rangle\rangle$ (proved analogously to Theorem 3.8) and η for F types.

- (5) Combining parts (1) and (2) gives the first equation, while combining parts (3) and (4) gives the second equation. □

Recall that for value types A_1 and A_2 , the CBV function type is $U(A_1 \rightarrow \underline{F}A_2)$. As a corollary of Theorems 3.15 and 3.17, we have

COROLLARY 3.18 (CAST UNIQUE IMPLEMENTATION FOR CBV FUNCTIONS).

$$\begin{aligned} \langle U(A'_1 \rightarrow \underline{F}A'_2) \hookrightarrow U(A_1 \rightarrow \underline{F}A_2) \rangle f &\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{thunk } (\lambda x'. \text{bind } x \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle (\text{ret } x'); \\ &\text{bind } y \leftarrow (\text{force } (f) x); \\ &\text{ret } (\langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle y)) \\ \langle \underline{F}U(A_1 \rightarrow \underline{F}A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}U(A'_1 \rightarrow \underline{F}A'_2) \rangle \bullet &\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{bind } f \leftarrow \bullet; \\ &\text{ret } \lambda x. \langle \underline{F}A_2 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle (\text{force } (f) (\langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle x)) \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. For the upcast, by Theorem 3.15, it's equal to

$$\text{thunk } (\lambda x'. \text{bind } x \leftarrow \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle (\text{ret } x'); \text{force } (\langle U\underline{F}A'_2 \hookrightarrow U\underline{F}A_2 \rangle (\text{thunk } (\text{force } (f) x'))))$$

By Theorem 3.17, $\langle U\underline{F}A'_2 \hookrightarrow U\underline{F}A_2 \rangle$ is equal to

$$\text{thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } -; \text{ret } (\langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle x))$$

so β -reducing force and thunk twice gives the result.

For the downcast, by Theorem 3.17, it's equal to

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } (\text{thunk } (\langle (A_1 \rightarrow \underline{F}A_2) \leftarrow (A_1 \rightarrow \underline{F}A_2) \rangle (\text{force } x))))$$

and by Theorem 3.15 $\langle (A_1 \rightarrow \underline{F}A_2) \leftarrow (A_1 \rightarrow \underline{F}A_2) \rangle -$ is equal to

$$\lambda x. \langle \underline{F}A_2 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle (- (\langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle x))$$

□

These are equivalent to the CBPV translations of the standard CBV wrapping implementations; for example, the CBV upcast term $\lambda x'. \text{let } x = \langle A_1 \leftarrow A'_1 \rangle x'; \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle (f x')$ has its evaluation order made explicit, and the fact that its upcast is a (complex) value exposed. In the downcast, the GTT term is free to let-bind $(\langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle x)$ to avoid duplicating it, but because it is a (complex)

value, it can also be substituted directly, which might expose reductions that can be optimized.

3.5 Least Dynamic Types

THEOREM 3.19 (LEAST DYNAMIC VALUE TYPE). *If \perp_v is a type such that $\perp_v \sqsubseteq A$ for all A , then in GTT with a strict initial object 0 , $\perp_v \cong_v 0$.*

PROOF. We have the upcast $x : \perp_v \vdash \langle 0 \leftarrow \perp_v \rangle x : 0$, so Lemma 3.2 gives the result. \square

The fact that \perp_v is strictly initial seems to depend on the fact that we have a strictly initial object: In GTT without a 0 type, it seems that we cannot prove that $x : \perp_v \vdash \langle A \leftarrow \perp_v \rangle x : A$ is the unique such map.

THEOREM 3.20 (LEAST DYNAMIC COMPUTATION TYPE). *If \perp_c is a type such that $\perp_c \sqsubseteq B$ for all B , and we have a terminal computation type \top , then $U\perp_c \cong_c U\top$.*

PROOF. We have stacks $\bullet : \top \langle \perp_c \leftarrow \top \rangle \bullet : \perp_c$ and $\bullet : \perp_c \vdash \{\} : \top$. The composite at \top is the identity by Lemma 3.3. However, because \top is not a strict terminal object, the dual of the above argument does not give a stack isomorphism $\perp_c \cong_c \top$.

However, using the retract axiom, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x : U\perp_c \vdash \langle U\top \leftarrow U\perp_c \rangle x : U\top \\ y : U\top \vdash \text{thunk } (\langle \perp_c \leftarrow \top \rangle (\text{force } x)) : U\perp_c \\ x : U\perp_c \vdash \text{thunk } (\langle \perp_c \leftarrow \top \rangle (\text{force } (\langle U\top \leftarrow U\perp_c \rangle x))) \sqsubseteq x : U\perp_c \end{aligned}$$

and the composite

$$y : U\top \vdash \langle U\top \leftarrow U\perp_c \rangle (\text{thunk } (\langle \perp_c \leftarrow \top \rangle (\text{force } x))) : U\top$$

is the identity by uniqueness for $U\top$ (Lemma 3.3). \square

This suggests taking $\perp_v := 0$ and $\perp_c := \top$.

THEOREM 3.21. *The casts determined by $0 \sqsubseteq A$ are*

$$\langle A \leftarrow 0 \rangle z \sqsubseteq \text{absurd } z \quad \langle \underline{F}0 \leftarrow \underline{F}A \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \text{bind } _ \leftarrow \bullet; \mathcal{U}$$

Dually, the casts determined by $\top \sqsubseteq B$ are

$$\langle \top \leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \{\} \quad \langle U\underline{B} \leftarrow U\top \rangle u \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \mathcal{U}$$

PROOF.

- (1) $x : 0 \vdash \langle A \hookrightarrow 0 \rangle x \sqsubseteq \text{abort } x : A$ is immediate by η for 0.
 (2) First, to show $\bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash \text{bind } _ \leftarrow \bullet; \mathcal{U} \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{F0} \leftarrow \underline{FA} \rangle \bullet$, we can η -expand the right-hand side into $\text{bind } x : A \leftarrow \bullet; \langle \underline{F0} \leftarrow \underline{FA} \rangle \text{ret } x$, at which point the result follows by congruence and the fact that type error is minimal, so $\mathcal{U} \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{F0} \leftarrow \underline{FA} \rangle \text{ret } x$.

Second, to show $\bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash \langle \underline{F0} \leftarrow \underline{FA} \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \text{bind } _ \leftarrow \bullet; \mathcal{U}$, we can η -expand the left-hand side to $\bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash \text{bind } y \leftarrow \langle \underline{F0} \leftarrow \underline{FA} \rangle \bullet; \text{ret } y$, so we need to show

$$\bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash \text{bind } y : 0 \leftarrow \langle \underline{F0} \leftarrow \underline{FA} \rangle \bullet; \text{ret } y \sqsubseteq \text{bind } y' : A \leftarrow \bullet; \mathcal{U} : \underline{F0}$$

We apply congruence, with $\bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash \langle \underline{F0} \leftarrow \underline{FA} \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : 0 \sqsubseteq A$ by the universal property of downcasts in the first premise, so it suffices to show

$$y \sqsubseteq y' : 0 \sqsubseteq A \vdash \text{ret } y \sqsubseteq \mathcal{U}_{\underline{F0}} : \underline{F0}$$

By transitivity with $y \sqsubseteq y' : 0 \sqsubseteq A \vdash \mathcal{U}_{\underline{F0}} \sqsubseteq \mathcal{U}_{\underline{F0}} : \underline{F0} \sqsubseteq \underline{F0}$, it suffices to show

$$y \sqsubseteq y : 0 \sqsubseteq 0 \vdash \text{ret } y \sqsubseteq \mathcal{U}_{\underline{F0}} : \underline{F0}$$

But now both sides are maps out of 0, and therefore equal by Lemma 3.2.

- (3) The downcast is immediate by η for \top , Lemma 3.3.

- (4) First,

$$u : U\top \vdash \text{thunk } \mathcal{U} \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } (\text{force } (\langle \underline{UB} \hookrightarrow U\top \rangle u)) \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{UB} \hookrightarrow U\top \rangle u : \underline{UB}$$

by congruence, η for U , and the fact that error is minimal. Conversely, to show

$$u : U\top \vdash \langle \underline{UB} \hookrightarrow U\top \rangle u \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \mathcal{U} : \underline{UB}$$

it suffices to show

$$u : U\top \vdash u \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \mathcal{U}_{\underline{B}} : U\top \sqsubseteq \underline{UB}$$

by the universal property of an upcast. By Lemma 3.3, any two elements of $U\top$ are equidynamic, so in particular $u \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \mathcal{U}_{\top}$, at which point congruence for thunk and $\mathcal{U}_{\top} \sqsubseteq \mathcal{U}_{\underline{B}} : \top \sqsubseteq \underline{B}$ gives the result.

□

3.6 Upcasts are Values, Downcasts are Stacks

Since GTT is an axiomatic theory, we can consider different fragments than the one presented in Section 2. Here, we use this flexibility to show that taking upcasts to be complex values and downcasts to be complex stacks is forced if this property

holds for casts between *ground* types and $?/\underline{\iota}$. For this section, we define a *ground type*³ to be generated by the following grammar:

$$G ::= 1 \mid ? \times ? \mid 0 \mid ? + ? \mid U \underline{\iota} \quad \underline{G} ::= ? \rightarrow \underline{\iota} \mid \top \mid \underline{\iota} \& \underline{\iota} \mid \underline{F}?$$

Definition 3.22 (Ground type dynamism). Let $A \sqsubseteq' A'$ and $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq' \underline{B}'$ be the relations defined by the rules in Figure 2 with the axioms $A \sqsubseteq ?$ and $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{\iota}$ restricted to ground types—i.e., replaced by $G \sqsubseteq ?$ and $\underline{G} \sqsubseteq \underline{\iota}$.

LEMMA 3.23. *For any type A , $A \sqsubseteq' ?$. For any type \underline{B} , $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq' \underline{\iota}$.*

PROOF. By induction on the type. For example, in the case for $A_1 + A_2$, we have by the inductive hypothesis $A_1 \sqsubseteq' ?$ and $A_2 \sqsubseteq' ?$, so $A_1 + A_2 \sqsubseteq' ? + ? \sqsubseteq ?$ by congruence and transitivity, because $? + ?$ is ground. In the case for $\underline{F}A$, we have $A \sqsubseteq ?$ by the inductive hypothesis, so $\underline{F}A \sqsubseteq \underline{F}? \sqsubseteq \underline{\iota}$. \square

LEMMA 3.24 (\sqsubseteq AND \sqsubseteq' AGREE). *$A \sqsubseteq A'$ iff $A \sqsubseteq' A'$ and $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$ iff $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq' \underline{B}'$*

PROOF. The “if” direction is immediate by induction because every rule of \sqsubseteq' is a rule of \sqsubseteq . To show \sqsubseteq is contained in \sqsubseteq' , we do induction on the derivation of \sqsubseteq , where every rule is true for \sqsubseteq' , except $A \sqsubseteq ?$ and $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{\iota}$, and for these, we use Lemma 3.23. \square

Let GTT_G be the fragment of GTT where the only primitive casts are those between ground types and the dynamic types, i.e. the cast terms are restricted to the substitution closures of

$$x : G \vdash \langle ? \hookrightarrow G \rangle x : ? \quad \bullet : \underline{F}? \vdash \langle \underline{F}G \hookleftarrow \underline{F}? \rangle \bullet : \underline{F}? \quad \bullet : \underline{\iota} \vdash \langle \underline{G} \hookleftarrow \underline{\iota} \rangle \bullet : \underline{\iota} \quad x : U\underline{G} \vdash \langle U\underline{\iota} \hookrightarrow U\underline{G} \rangle x : \underline{\iota}$$

LEMMA 3.25 (CASTS ARE ADMISSIBLE). *In GTT_G it is admissible that*

- (1) *for all $A \sqsubseteq A'$ there is a complex value $\langle \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rangle$ satisfying the universal property of an upcast and a complex stack $\langle \langle \underline{F}A \hookleftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle \rangle$ satisfying the universal property of a downcast*

³In gradual typing, “ground” is used to mean a one-level unrolling of a dynamic type, not first-order data.

- (2) for all $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$ there is a complex stack $\langle\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle\rangle$ satisfying the universal property of a downcast and a complex value $\langle\langle \underline{UB}' \leftarrow \underline{UB} \rangle\rangle$ satisfying the universal property of an upcast.

PROOF. To streamline the exposition above, we stated Theorems 3.8, Theorem 3.15 Theorem 3.17 as showing that the “definitions” of each cast are equidynamic with the cast that is a priori postulated to exist (e.g. $\langle A'' \leftarrow A \rangle \sqsubseteq \langle A'' \leftarrow A' \rangle \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle$). However, the proofs factor through Theorem 3.7 and Lemma 3.13 and Lemma 3.14, which show directly that the right-hand sides have the desired universal property—i.e. the stipulation that some cast with the correct universal property exists is not used in the proof that the implementation has the desired universal property. Moreover, the proofs given do not rely on any axioms of GTT besides the universal properties of the “smaller” casts used in the definition and the $\beta\eta$ rules for the relevant types. So these proofs can be used as the inductive steps here, in GTT_G. By induction on type dynamism $A \sqsubseteq' A'$ and $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq' \underline{B}'$.

(We chose not to make this more explicit above, because we believe the equational description in a language with all casts is a clearer description of the results, because it avoids needing to hypothesize terms that behave as the smaller casts in each case.)

We show a few representative cases:

In the cases for $G \sqsubseteq ?$ or $\underline{G} \sqsubseteq \underline{i}$, we have assumed appropriate casts $\langle ? \leftarrow G \rangle$ and $\langle \underline{FG} \leftarrow \underline{F?} \rangle$ and $\langle \underline{G} \leftarrow \underline{i} \rangle$ and $\langle \underline{U\underline{i}} \leftarrow \underline{UG} \rangle$.

In the case for identity $A \sqsubseteq A$, we need to show that there is an upcast $\langle A \leftarrow A \rangle$ and a downcast $\langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA} \rangle$. The proof of Theorem 3.8 shows that the identity value and stack have the correct universal property.

In the case where type dynamism was concluded by transitivity between $A \sqsubseteq A'$ and $A' \sqsubseteq A''$, by the inductive hypotheses we get upcasts $\langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle$ and $\langle A'' \leftarrow A' \rangle$, and the proof of Theorem 3.8 shows that defining $\langle A'' \leftarrow A \rangle$ to be $\langle A'' \leftarrow A' \rangle \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle$ has the correct universal property. For the downcast, we get $\langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA'} \rangle$ and $\langle \underline{FA'} \leftarrow \underline{FA''} \rangle$ by the inductive hypotheses, and the proof of Theorem 3.8 shows that their composition has the correct universal property.

In the case where type dynamism was concluded by the congruence rule for $A_1 + A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_1 + A'_2$ from $A_i \sqsubseteq A'_i$, we have upcasts $\langle A'_i \leftarrow A_i \rangle$ and downcasts $\langle \underline{FA}_i \leftarrow \underline{FA'_i} \rangle$ by the inductive hypothesis, and the proof of Theorem 3.8 shows that the definitions given there have the desired universal property.

In the case where type dynamism was concluded by the congruence rule for $\underline{FA} \sqsubseteq \underline{FA'}$ from $A \sqsubseteq A'$, we obtain by induction an upcast $A \sqsubseteq A'$ and a downcast $\langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA'} \rangle$. We need a downcast $\langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA'} \rangle$, which we have, and an upcast $\langle \underline{UFA} \leftarrow \underline{UFA'} \rangle$, which is constructed as in Theorem 3.17. \square

As discussed in Section 2.4, rather than an upcast being a complex value $x : A \vdash \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x : A'$, an a priori more general type would be a stack $\bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash \langle \underline{FA}' \hookrightarrow \underline{FA} \rangle \bullet : \underline{FA}'$, which allows the upcast to perform effects; dually, an a priori more general type for a downcast $\bullet : \underline{B}' \vdash \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \bullet : \underline{B}$ would be a value $x : \underline{UB}' \vdash \langle \underline{UB} \leftarrow \underline{UB}' \rangle x : \underline{UB}$, which allows the downcast to ignore its argument. The following shows that in GTT_G , if we postulate such stack upcasts/value downcasts as originally suggested in Section 2.4, then in fact these casts *must* be equal to the action of U/\underline{F} on some value upcasts/stack downcasts, so the potential for (co)effectfulness affords no additional flexibility.

THEOREM 3.26 (UPCASTS ARE NECESSARILY VALUES, DOWNCASTS ARE NECESSARILY STACKS). *Suppose we extend GTT_G with the following postulated stack upcasts and value downcasts (in the sense of Definition 3.16): For every type precision $A \sqsubseteq A'$, there is a stack upcast $\bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash \langle \underline{FA}' \hookrightarrow \underline{FA} \rangle \bullet : \underline{FA}'$, and for every $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$, there is a complex value downcast $x : \underline{UB}' \vdash \langle \underline{UB} \leftarrow \underline{UB}' \rangle x : \underline{UB}$.*

Then there exists a value upcast $\langle\langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle\rangle$ and a stack downcast $\langle\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle\rangle$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash \langle \underline{FA}' \hookrightarrow \underline{FA} \rangle \bullet &\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq (\text{bind } x : A \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } (\langle\langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle\rangle x)) \\ x : \underline{UB}' \vdash \langle \underline{UB} \leftarrow \underline{UB}' \rangle x &\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq (\text{thunk } (\langle\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle\rangle (\text{force } x))) \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. Lemma 3.25 constructs $\langle\langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle\rangle$ and $\langle\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle\rangle$, so the proof of Theorem 3.17 (which really works for any $\langle\langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle\rangle$ and $\langle\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle\rangle$ with the correct universal properties, not only the postulated casts) implies that the right-hand sides of the above equations are stack upcasts and value downcasts of the appropriate type. Since stack upcasts/value downcasts are unique by an argument analogous to Theorem 3.7, the postulated casts must be equal to these. \square

Indeed, the following a priori even more general assumption provides no more flexibility:

THEOREM 3.27 (UPCASTS ARE NECESSARILY VALUES, DOWNCASTS ARE NECESSARILY STACKS II). *Suppose we extend GTT_G only with postulated monadic upcasts $x : \underline{UFA} \vdash \langle \underline{UFA}' \hookrightarrow \underline{UFA} \rangle x : \underline{UFA}'$ for every $A \sqsubseteq A'$ and comonadic downcasts $\bullet : \underline{FUB}' \vdash \langle \underline{FUB} \leftarrow \underline{FUB}' \rangle \bullet : \underline{FUB}$ for every $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$.*

Then there exists a value upcast $\langle\langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle\rangle$ and a stack downcast $\langle\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle\rangle$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} x : \underline{UFA} \vdash \langle \underline{UFA}' \hookrightarrow \underline{UFA} \rangle x &\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } (\text{bind } x : A \leftarrow \text{force } x; \text{ret } (\langle\langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle\rangle x)) \\ \bullet : \underline{FUB}' \vdash \langle \underline{FUB} \leftarrow \underline{FUB}' \rangle \bullet &\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' : \underline{UB}' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } (\text{thunk } (\langle\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle\rangle (\text{force } x))) \end{aligned}$$

In CBV terms, the monadic upcast is like an upcast from A to A' taking having type $(1 \rightarrow A) \rightarrow A'$, i.e. it takes a thunked effectful computation of an A as input and produces an effectful computation of an A' .

PROOF. Again, Lemma 3.25 constructs $\langle\langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle\rangle$ and $\langle\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle\rangle$, so the proof of part (5) of Theorem 3.17 gives the result. \square

3.7 Equidynamic Types are Isomorphic

THEOREM 3.28 (EQUIDYNAMISM IMPLIES ISOMORPHISM).

- (1) If $A \sqsubseteq A'$ and $A' \sqsubseteq A$ then $A \cong_v A'$.
- (2) If $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$ and $\underline{B}' \sqsubseteq \underline{B}$ then $\underline{B} \cong_c \underline{B}'$.

PROOF.

- (1) We have upcasts $x : A \vdash \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x : A'$ and $x' : A' \vdash \langle A \hookrightarrow A' \rangle x' : A$. For the composites, to show $x : A \vdash \langle A \hookrightarrow A' \rangle \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x \sqsubseteq x$ we apply upcast left twice, and conclude $x \sqsubseteq x$ by assumption. To show, $x : A \vdash x \sqsubseteq \langle A \hookrightarrow A' \rangle \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x$, we have $x : A \vdash x \sqsubseteq \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x : A \sqsubseteq A'$ by upcast right, and therefore $x : A \vdash x \sqsubseteq \langle A \hookrightarrow A' \rangle \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x : A \sqsubseteq A$ again by upcast right. The other composite is the same proof with A and A' swapped.
- (2) We have downcasts $\bullet : \underline{B} \vdash \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \bullet : \underline{B}'$ and $\bullet : \underline{B}' \vdash \langle \underline{B}' \leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle \bullet : \underline{B}$. For the composites, to show $\bullet : \underline{B} \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{B}' \leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \bullet$, we apply downcast right twice, and conclude $\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet$. For $\langle \underline{B}' \leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet$, we first have $\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$ by downcast left, and then the result by another application of downcast left. The other composite is the same proof with \underline{B} and \underline{B}' swapped. \square

4 CONTRACT MODELS OF GTT

To show the soundness of our theory, and demonstrate its relationship to operational definitions of observational equivalence and the gradual guarantee, we develop *models* of GTT using observational error approximation of a *non-gradual* CBPV. We call this the *contract translation* because it translates the built-in casts of the gradual language into ordinary terms implemented in a non-gradual language. While contracts are typically implemented in a dynamically typed language, our target is typed, retaining type information similarly to manifest contracts [Greenberg et al. 2010]. We give implementations of the dynamic value type in the usual

way as a recursive sum of basic value types, i.e., using type tags, and we give implementations of the dynamic computation type as the dual: a recursive product of basic computation types.

Writing $\llbracket M \rrbracket$ for any of the contract translations, the remaining sections of the paper establish:

THEOREM 4.1 (EQUI-DYNAMISM IMPLIES OBSERVATIONAL EQUIVALENCE). *If $\Gamma \vdash M_1 \sqsubseteq M_2 : \underline{B}$, then for any closing GTT context $C : (\Gamma \vdash \underline{B}) \Rightarrow (\cdot \vdash \underline{F}(1 + 1))$, $\llbracket C[M_1] \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket C[M_2] \rrbracket$ have the same behavior: both diverge, both run to an error, or both run to true or both run to false.*

THEOREM 4.2 (GRADUALITY). *If $\Gamma_1 \sqsubseteq \Gamma_2 \vdash M_1 \sqsubseteq M_2 : B_1 \sqsubseteq B_2$, then for any GTT context $C : (\Gamma_1 \vdash B_1) \Rightarrow (\cdot \vdash \underline{F}(1 + 1))$, and any valid interpretation of the dynamic types, either*

- (1) $\llbracket C[M_1] \rrbracket \Downarrow \mathcal{U}$, or
- (2) $\llbracket C[M_1] \rrbracket \Uparrow$ and $\llbracket C[\langle B_1 \leftarrow B_2 \rangle M_2[\langle \Gamma_2 \leftarrow \Gamma_1 \rangle \Gamma_1]] \rrbracket \Uparrow$, or
- (3) $\llbracket C[M_1] \rrbracket \Downarrow \text{ret } V$, $\llbracket C[\langle B_1 \leftarrow B_2 \rangle M_2[\langle \Gamma_2 \leftarrow \Gamma_1 \rangle \Gamma_1]] \rrbracket \Downarrow \text{ret } V$, and $V = \text{true}$ or $V = \text{false}$.

As a consequence we will also get consistency of our logic of dynamism:

COROLLARY 4.3 (CONSISTENCY OF GTT). $\cdot \vdash \text{ret true} \sqsubseteq \text{ret false} : \underline{F}(1 + 1)$ is not provable in GTT.

PROOF. They are distinguished by the identity context. □

We break down this proof into 3 major steps.

- (1) (This section) We translate GTT into a statically typed CBPV* language where the casts of GTT are translated to “contracts” in GTT: i.e., CBPV terms that implement the runtime type checking. We translate the term dynamism of GTT to an inequational theory for CBPV. Our translation is parameterized by the implementation of the dynamic types, and we demonstrate two valid implementations, one more direct and one more Scheme-like.
- (2) (Section 5) Next, we eliminate all uses of complex values and stacks from the CBPV language. We translate the complex values and stacks to terms with a proof that they are “pure” (thunkable or linear [Munch-Maccagnoni 2014]). This part has little to do with GTT specifically, except that it shows the behavioral property that corresponds to upcasts being complex values and downcasts being complex stacks.

- (3) (Section 6.3) Finally, with complex values and stacks eliminated, we give a standard operational semantics for CBPV and define a *logical relation* that is sound and complete with respect to observational error approximation. Using the logical relation, we show that the inequational theory of CBPV is sound for observational error approximation.

By composing these, we get a model of GTT where equidynamism is sound for observational equivalence and an operational semantics that satisfies the graduality theorem.

4.1 Call-by-push-value

Next, we define the call-by-push-value language CBPV* that will be the target for our contract translations of GTT. CBPV* is the axiomatic version of call-by-push-value *with* complex values and stacks, while CBPV (Section 5) will designate the operational version of call-by-push-value with only operational values and stacks. CBPV* is almost a subset of GTT obtained as follows: We remove the casts and the dynamic types $\text{?}, \text{!}$ (the shaded pieces) from the syntax and typing rules in Figure 1. There is no type dynamism, and the inequational theory of CBPV* is the homogeneous fragment of term dynamism in Figure 3 and Figure 4 (judgements $\Gamma \vdash E \sqsubseteq E' : T$ where $\Gamma \vdash E, E' : T$, with all the same rules in that figure thus restricted). The inequational axioms are the Type Universal Properties ($\beta\eta$ rules) and Error Properties (with ErrBot made homogeneous) from Figure 5. To implement the casts and dynamic types, we *add* general *recursive* value types ($\mu X.A$, the fixed point of X val type $\vdash A$ val type) and *corecursive* computation types ($\nu Y.B$, the fixed point of Y comp type $\vdash B$ comp type). The recursive type $\mu X.A$ is a value type with constructor `roll`, whose eliminator is pattern matching, whereas the corecursive type $\nu Y.B$ is a computation type defined by its eliminator (`unroll`), with an introduction form that we also write as `roll`. We extend the inequational theory with monotonicity of each term constructor of the recursive types, and with their $\beta\eta$ rules.

In the following figure, we write $+ ::=$ and $- ::=$ to indicate the diff from the grammar in Figure 1.

4.2 Interpreting the Dynamic Types

As shown in Theorems 3.8, 3.15, 3.17, almost all of the contract translation is uniquely determined already. However, the interpretation of the dynamic types and the casts between the dynamic types and ground types G and \underline{G} are not determined (they were still postulated in Lemma 3.25). For this reason, our translation is *parameterized* by an interpretation of the dynamic types and the ground casts. By

Value Types	A	$+ ::= \mu X.A \mid X$ $- ::= ?$
Computation Types	\underline{B}	$+ ::= \nu \underline{Y}.\underline{B} \mid \underline{Y}$ $- ::= \underline{\dot{c}}$
Values	V	$+ ::= \text{roll}_{\mu X.A} V$ $- ::= \langle A \hookrightarrow A \rangle V$
Terms	M	$+ ::= \text{roll}_{\nu \underline{Y}.\underline{B}} M \mid \text{unroll } M$ $M - ::= \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle M$
Both	E	$+ ::= \text{unroll } V \text{ to roll } x.E$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash V : A[\mu X.A/X]}{\Gamma \vdash \text{roll}_{\mu X.A} V : \mu X.A} \mu I \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash V : \mu X.A \quad \Gamma, x : A[\mu X.A/X] \mid \Delta \vdash E : T}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \text{unroll } V \text{ to roll } x.E : T} \mu E$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M : \underline{B}[\nu \underline{Y}.\underline{B}]}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \text{roll}_{\nu \underline{Y}.\underline{B}} M : \nu \underline{Y}.\underline{B}} \nu I$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M : \nu \underline{Y}.\underline{B}}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \text{unroll } M : \underline{B}[\nu \underline{Y}.\underline{B}]} \nu E \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A[\mu X.A/X]}{\Gamma \vdash \text{roll } V \sqsubseteq \text{roll } V' : \mu X.A} \mu \text{ICong}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : \mu X.A \quad \Gamma, x : A[\mu X.A/X] \mid \Delta \vdash E \sqsubseteq E' : T}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \text{unroll } V \text{ to roll } x.E \sqsubseteq \text{unroll } V' \text{ to roll } x.E' : T} \mu \text{ECong}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B}[\nu \underline{Y}.\underline{B}/\underline{Y}]}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \text{roll } M \sqsubseteq \text{roll } M' : \nu \underline{Y}.\underline{B}} \nu \text{ICong}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \nu \underline{Y}.\underline{B}}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \text{unroll } M \sqsubseteq \text{unroll } M' : \underline{B}[\nu \underline{Y}.\underline{B}/\underline{Y}]} \nu \text{ECong}$$

Recursive Type Axioms

	β	η
μ	$\text{unroll roll } V \text{ to roll } x.E \sqsubseteq E[V/x]$	$E \sqsubseteq \text{unroll } x \text{ to roll } y.E[\text{roll } y/x]$ where $x : \mu X.A \vdash E : T$
ν	$\text{unroll roll } M \sqsubseteq M$	$\bullet : \nu \underline{Y}.\underline{B} \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \text{roll unroll } \bullet : \nu \underline{Y}.\underline{B}$

Fig. 6. CBPV* types, terms, recursive types (diff from GTT), full rules in the extended version

Theorems 3.9, 3.10, we know that these must be *embedding-projection pairs* (ep pairs), which we now define in CBPV*. There are two kinds of ep pairs we consider:

those between value types (where the embedding models an upcast) and those between computation types (where the projection models a downcast).

Definition 4.4 (Value and Computation Embedding-Projection Pairs).

- (1) A *value ep pair* from A to A' consists of an *embedding* value $x : A \vdash V_e : A'$ and *projection* stack $\bullet : \underline{FA}' \vdash S_p : \underline{FA}$, satisfying the *retraction* and *projection* properties:

$$x : A \vdash \text{ret } x \sqsubseteq S_p[\text{ret } V_e] : \underline{FA} \quad \bullet : \underline{FA}' \vdash \text{bind } x \leftarrow S_p; \text{ret } V_e \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{FA}'$$

- (2) A *computation ep pair* from \underline{B} to \underline{B}' consists of an *embedding* value $z : \underline{UB} \vdash V_e : \underline{UB}'$ and a *projection* stack $\bullet : \underline{B}' \vdash S_p : \underline{B}$ satisfying *retraction* and *projection* properties:

$$z : \underline{UB} \vdash \text{force } z \sqsubseteq S_p[\text{force } V_e] : \underline{B} \quad w : \underline{UB}' \vdash V_e[\text{thunk } S_p[\text{force } w]] \sqsubseteq w : \underline{UB}'$$

While this formulation is very convenient in that both kinds of ep pairs are pairs of a value and a stack, the projection properties are often occur more naturally in the following forms:

LEMMA 4.5 (ALTERNATIVE PROJECTION). *If (V_e, S_p) is a value ep pair from A to A' and $\Gamma, y : A' \mid \Delta \vdash M : \underline{B}$, then*

$$\Gamma, x' : A' \vdash \text{bind } x \leftarrow S_p[\text{ret } x']; M[V_e/y] \sqsubseteq M[x'/y]$$

Similarly, if (V_e, S_p) is a computation ep pair from \underline{B} to \underline{B}' , and $\Gamma \vdash M : \underline{B}'$ then

$$\Gamma \vdash V_e[\text{thunk } S_p[M]] \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } M : \underline{UB}'$$

PROOF. For the first,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{bind } x \leftarrow S_p[\text{ret } x']; M[V_e/y] &\sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow (\text{bind } x \leftarrow S_p[\text{ret } x']; \text{ret } V_e); M && (\text{comm conv, } \underline{F}\beta) \\ &\text{bind } y \leftarrow \text{ret } x'; M && (\text{projection}) \\ &M[x'/y] && (\underline{F}\beta) \end{aligned}$$

For the second,

$$\begin{aligned} V_e[\text{thunk } S_p[M]] &\sqsubseteq V_e[\text{thunk } S_p[\text{force } \text{thunk } M]] && (U\beta) \\ &\sqsubseteq \text{thunk } M && (\text{projection}) \end{aligned}$$

□

Using this, and using the notion of ground type from Section 3.6 with 0 and \top removed, we define

Definition 4.6 (Dynamic Type Interpretation). A $?, \underline{\iota}$ interpretation ρ consists of (1) a CBPV value type $\rho(?)$, (2) a CBPV computation type $\rho(\underline{\iota})$, (3) for each value ground type G , a value ep pair $(x.\rho_e(G), \rho_p(G))$ from $\llbracket G \rrbracket_\rho$ to $\rho(?)$, and (4) for each computation ground type \underline{G} , a computation ep pair $(z.\rho_e(\underline{G}), \rho_p(\underline{G}))$ from $\llbracket \underline{G} \rrbracket_\rho$ to $\rho(\underline{\iota})$. We write $\llbracket G \rrbracket_\rho$ and $\llbracket \underline{G} \rrbracket_\rho$ for the interpretation of a ground type, replacing $?$ with $\rho(?)$, $\underline{\iota}$ with $\rho(\underline{\iota})$, and compositionally otherwise.

Next, we show several possible interpretations of the dynamic type that will all give, by construction, implementations that satisfy the gradual guarantee. Our interpretations of the value dynamic type are not surprising. They are the usual construction of the dynamic type using type tags: i.e., a recursive sum of basic value types. On the other hand, our interpretations of the computation dynamic type are less familiar. In duality with the interpretation of $?$, we interpret $\underline{\iota}$ as a recursive *product* of basic computation types. This interpretation has some analogues in previous work on the duality of computation [Girard 2001; Zeilberger 2009], but the most direct interpretation (definition 4.10) does not correspond to any known work on dynamic/gradual typing. Then we show that a particular choice of which computation types is basic and which are derived produces an interpretation of the dynamic computation type as a type of variable-arity functions whose arguments are passed on the stack, producing a model similar to Scheme without accounting for control effects (definition 4.15).

4.2.1 Natural Dynamic Type Interpretation. Our first dynamic type interpretation is to make the value and computation dynamic types sums and products of the ground value and computation types, respectively. This forms a model of GTT for the following reasons. For the value dynamic type $?$, we need a value embedding (the upcast) from each ground value type G with a corresponding projection. The easiest way to do this would be if for each G , we could rewrite $?$ as a sum of the values that fit G and those that don't: $? \cong G + ?_{-G}$ because of the following lemma.

LEMMA 4.7 (SUM INJECTIONS ARE VALUE EMBEDDINGS). *For any A, A' , there are value ep pairs from A and A' to $A + A'$ where the embeddings are inl and inr .*

PROOF. Define the embedding of A to just be $x.\text{inl } x$ and the projection to be $\text{bind } y \leftarrow \bullet; \text{case } y\{\text{inl } x.\text{ret } x \mid \text{inr } \cdot\mathcal{U}\}$. This satisfies retraction (using $\underline{F}(+)$ induction (lemma 4.8), inr case is the same):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{bind } y \leftarrow \text{inl } x; \text{case } y\{\text{inl } x.\text{ret } x \mid \text{inr } \cdot\mathcal{U}\} &\sqsubseteq \text{case inl } x\{\text{inl } x.\text{ret } x \mid \text{inr } \cdot\mathcal{U}\} \\ &\quad (F\beta) \\ &\sqsubseteq \text{ret } x \quad (+\beta) \end{aligned}$$

and projection (similarly using $\underline{F}(+)$ induction):

$$\begin{aligned}
 x' : A + A' \vdash \text{bind } (\text{bind } y \leftarrow \text{ret } x'; \text{case } y \{ \text{inl } x. \text{ret } x \mid \text{inr } \cdot \mathcal{U} \}) \leftarrow x; \text{ret inl } x \\
 &\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } (\text{case } x' \{ \text{inl } x. \text{ret } x \mid \text{inr } \cdot \mathcal{U} \}) \leftarrow x; \text{ret inl } x && (F\beta) \\
 &\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq (\text{case } x' \{ \text{inl } x. \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } x; \text{ret inl } x \mid \text{inr } \cdot \text{bind } x \leftarrow \mathcal{U}; \text{ret inl } x \}) && (\text{commuting conversion}) \\
 &\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq (\text{case } x' \{ \text{inl } x. \text{ret inl } x \mid \text{inr } \cdot \mathcal{U} \}) && (F\beta, \mathcal{U} \text{ strictness}) \\
 &\sqsubseteq (\text{case } x' \{ \text{inl } x. \text{ret inl } x \mid \text{inr } y. \text{ret inl } y \}) && (\mathcal{U} \text{ bottom}) \\
 &\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{ret } x' && (+\eta)
 \end{aligned}$$

□

Whose proof relies on the following induction principle for the returner type:

LEMMA 4.8 ($\underline{F}(+)$ INDUCTION PRINCIPLE). $\Gamma \mid \cdot : \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2) \vdash M_1 \sqsubseteq M_2 : \underline{B}$ holds if and only if $\Gamma, V_1 : A_1 \vdash M_1[\text{ret inl } V_1] \sqsubseteq M_2[\text{ret inl } V_2] : \underline{B}$ and $\Gamma, V_2 : A_2 \vdash M_2[\text{ret inr } V_2] \sqsubseteq M_2[\text{ret inr } V_2] : \underline{B}$

This shows why the type tag interpretation works: it makes the dynamic type in some sense the minimal type with injections from each G : the sum of all value ground types $? \cong \Sigma_G G$.

The dynamic computation type $\underline{\iota}$ can be naturally defined by a dual construction, by the following dual argument. First, we want a computation ep pair from \underline{G} to $\underline{\iota}$ for each ground computation type \underline{G} . Specifically, this means we want a stack from $\underline{\iota}$ to \underline{G} (the downcast) with an embedding. The easiest way to get this is if, for each ground computation type \underline{G} , $\underline{\iota}$ is equivalent to a lazy product of \underline{G} and “the other behaviors”, i.e., $\underline{\iota} \cong \underline{G} \& \underline{\iota}_{-\underline{G}}$. Then the embedding on π performs the embedded computation, but on π' raises a type error. The following lemma, dual to lemma 4.7 shows this forms a computation ep pair:

LEMMA 4.9 (LAZY PRODUCT PROJECTIONS ARE COMPUTATION PROJECTIONS). For any $\underline{B}, \underline{B}'$, there are computation ep pairs from \underline{B} and \underline{B}' to $\underline{B} \& \underline{B}'$ where the projections are π and π' .

PROOF. Define the projection for \underline{B} to be π . Define the embedding by $z. \{ \pi \mapsto \text{force } z \mid \pi' \mapsto \mathcal{U} \}$. Similarly define the projection for \underline{B}' . This satisfies retraction:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \pi \text{force } \text{thunk } \{ \pi \mapsto \text{force } z \mid \pi' \mapsto \mathcal{U} \} &\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \pi \{ \pi \mapsto \text{force } z \mid \pi' \mapsto \mathcal{U} \} && (U\beta) \\
 &\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{force } z && (\&\beta)
 \end{aligned}$$

and projection:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{thunk } \{\pi \mapsto \text{force thunk } \pi \text{ force } w \mid \pi' \mapsto \mathcal{U}\} \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \{\pi \mapsto \pi \text{ force } w \mid \pi' \mapsto \mathcal{U}\} & (U\beta) \\
& \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \{\pi \mapsto \pi \text{ force } w \mid \pi' \mapsto \pi' \text{ force } w\} & (U \text{ bottom}) \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk force } w & (&\eta) \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq w & (U\eta)
\end{aligned}$$

□

From this, we see that the easiest way to construct an interpretation of the dynamic computation type is to make it a lazy product of all the ground types \underline{G} : $\underline{\iota} \cong \&\underline{G} \underline{G}$. Using recursive types, we can easily make this a definition of the interpretations:

Definition 4.10 (Natural Dynamic Type Interpretation). The following defines a dynamic type interpretation. We define the types to satisfy the isomorphisms

$$? \cong 1 + (? \times ?) + (? + ?) + U\underline{\iota} \quad \underline{\iota} \cong (\underline{\iota} \& \underline{\iota}) \& (? \rightarrow \underline{\iota}) \& \underline{F}?$$

with the ep pairs defined as in Lemma 4.7 and 4.9.

PROOF. We can construct $?, \underline{\iota}$ explicitly using recursive and corecursive types. Specifically, we make the recursion explicit by defining open versions of the types:

$$\begin{aligned}
X, \underline{Y} \vdash ?_o &= 1 + (X \times X) + (X + X) + U\underline{Y} \text{ val type} \\
X, \underline{Y} \vdash \underline{\iota}_o &= (\underline{Y} \& \underline{Y}) \& (X \rightarrow \underline{Y}) \& \underline{F}X \text{ comp type}
\end{aligned}$$

Then we define the types $?, \underline{\iota}$ using a standard encoding:

$$\begin{aligned}
? &= \mu X. ?_o[\nu \underline{Y}. \underline{\iota}_o / \underline{Y}] \\
\underline{\iota} &= \nu \underline{Y}. \underline{\iota}_o[\mu X. ?_o / X]
\end{aligned}$$

Then clearly by the roll/unroll isomorphism we get the desired isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned}
? &\cong ?_o[\underline{\iota} / \underline{Y}, ? / X] = 1 + (? \times ?) + (? + ?) + U\underline{\iota} \\
\underline{\iota} &\cong ?_c[? / X, \underline{\iota} / \underline{Y}] = (\underline{\iota} \& \underline{\iota}) \& (? \rightarrow \underline{\iota}) \& \underline{F}?
\end{aligned}$$

□

This dynamic type interpretation is a natural fit for CBPV because the introduction forms for $?$ are exactly the introduction forms for all of the value types (unit, pairing, inl, inr, force), while elimination forms are all of the elimination forms for computation types (π, π' , application and binding); such “bityped” languages are related to Girard [2001]; Zeilberger [2009]. Based on this dynamic type interpretation, we can extend GTT to support a truly dynamically typed style

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash V : ? \quad \Gamma, x_1 : 1 \mid \Delta \vdash E_1 : T \quad \Gamma, x_\times : ? \times ? \mid \Delta \vdash E_\times : T \quad \Gamma, x_U : U \underline{\dot{?}} \mid \Delta \vdash E_U : T}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \text{tycase } V \{x_1.E_1 \mid x_\times.E_\times \mid x_+.E_+ \mid x_U.E_U\} : T} \text{(?E)} \\
\\
\text{tycase } (\langle ? \rhd G \rangle V) \{x_1.E_1 \mid x_\times.E_\times \mid x_+.E_+ \mid x_U.E_U\} \sqsubseteq E_G[V/x_G] \quad (? \beta) \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, x : ? \mid \Delta \vdash E : \underline{B}}{E \sqsubseteq \text{tycase } x \{x_1.E[\langle ? \rhd 1 \rangle / x_1] \mid x_\times.E[\langle ? \rhd \times \rangle / x_\times] \mid x_+.E[\langle ? \rhd + \rangle / x_+] \mid x_U.E[\langle ? \rhd U \rangle / x_U]\}} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M_\rightarrow : ? \rightarrow \underline{\dot{?}} \quad \Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M_\& : \underline{\dot{?}} \& \underline{\dot{?}} \quad \Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M_\underline{F} : \underline{F}}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \{\& \mapsto M_\& \mid (\rightarrow) \mapsto M_\rightarrow \mid \underline{F} \mapsto M_\underline{F}\} : \underline{\dot{?}}} \underline{\dot{?}} \\
\\
\langle \underline{G} \ll \underline{\dot{?}} \rangle \{\& \mapsto M_\& \mid (\rightarrow) \mapsto M_\rightarrow \mid \underline{F} \mapsto M_\underline{F}\} \sqsubseteq M_\underline{G} \quad (\underline{\dot{?}} \beta) \\
\\
\bullet : \underline{\dot{?}} \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \{\& \mapsto \langle \underline{\dot{?}} \& \underline{\dot{?}} \ll \underline{\dot{?}} \rangle \bullet \mid (\rightarrow) \mapsto \langle ? \rightarrow \underline{\dot{?}} \ll \underline{\dot{?}} \rangle \bullet \mid \underline{F} \mapsto \langle \underline{F} \ll \underline{\dot{?}} \rangle \bullet \} \quad (\underline{\dot{?}} \eta)
\end{array}$$

Fig. 7. Natural Dynamic Type Extension of GTT

of programming, where one can perform case-analysis on the dynamic types at runtime, in addition to the type assertions provided by upcasts and downcasts.

The axioms we choose might seem to under-specify the dynamic type, but because of the uniqueness of adjoints, the following are derivable.

LEMMA 4.11 (NATURAL DYNAMIC TYPE EXTENSION THEOREMS). *The following are derivable in GTT with the natural dynamic type extension*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \underline{F} \ll \underline{F} \rangle \text{ret } V \sqsubseteq \text{tycase } V \{x_1.\text{ret } x_1 \mid \text{else } \mathbb{U}\} \\
&\langle \underline{F}(\times ?) \ll \underline{F} \rangle \text{ret } V \sqsubseteq \text{tycase } V \{x_\times.\text{ret } x_\times \mid \text{else } \mathbb{U}\} \\
&\langle \underline{F}(+ ?) \ll \underline{F} \rangle \text{ret } V \sqsubseteq \text{tycase } V \{x_+.\text{ret } x_+ \mid \text{else } \mathbb{U}\} \\
&\langle \underline{F}U \underline{\dot{?}} \ll \underline{F} \rangle \text{ret } V \sqsubseteq \text{tycase } V \{x_U.\text{ret } x_U \mid \text{else } \mathbb{U}\} \\
&\text{force } \langle U \underline{\dot{?}} \rhd U(\underline{\dot{?}} \& \underline{\dot{?}}) \rangle V \sqsubseteq \{\& \mapsto \text{force } V \mid (\rightarrow) \mapsto \mathbb{U} \mid \underline{F} \mapsto \mathbb{U}\} \\
&\text{force } \langle U \underline{\dot{?}} \rhd U(? \rightarrow \underline{\dot{?}}) \rangle V \sqsubseteq \{\& \mapsto \mathbb{U} \mid (\rightarrow) \mapsto \text{force } V \mid \underline{F} \mapsto \mathbb{U}\} \\
&\text{force } \langle U \underline{\dot{?}} \rhd U \underline{F} \rangle V \sqsubseteq \{\& \mapsto \mathbb{U} \mid (\rightarrow) \mapsto \mathbb{U} \mid \underline{F} \mapsto \text{force } V\}
\end{aligned}$$

We explore this in more detail with the next dynamic type interpretation.

Next, we easily see that if we want to limit GTT to just the CBV types (i.e. the only computation types are $A \rightarrow \underline{F}A'$), then we can restrict the dynamic types as follows:

Definition 4.12 (CBV Dynamic Type Interpretation). The following is a dynamic type interpretation for the ground types of GTT with only function computation types:

$$? \cong 1 + (? + ?) + (? \times ?) + U(\underline{?}) \quad \underline{?} \cong ? \rightarrow \underline{F?}$$

And finally if we restrict GTT to only CBN types (i.e., the only value type is booleans $1 + 1$), we can restrict the dynamic types as follows:

Definition 4.13 (CBN Dynamic Type Interpretation). The following is a dynamic type interpretation for the ground types of GTT with only boolean value types:

$$? = (1 + 1) \quad \underline{?} \cong (\underline{?} \& \underline{?}) \& (U\underline{?} \rightarrow \underline{?}) \& \underline{F?}$$

4.2.2 Scheme-like Dynamic Type Interpretation. The above dynamic type interpretation does not correspond to any dynamically typed language used in practice, in part because it includes explicit cases for the “additives”, the sum type $+$ and lazy product type $\&$. Normally, these are not included in this way, but rather sums are encoded by making each case use a fresh constructor (using nominal techniques like opaque structs in Racket) and then making the sum the union of the constructors, as argued in [Siek and Tobin-Hochstadt \[2016\]](#). We leave modeling this nominal structure to future work, but in minimalist languages, such as simple dialects of Scheme and Lisp, sum types are often encoded *structurally* rather than nominally by using some fixed sum type of *symbols*, also called *atoms*. Then a value of a sum type is modeled by a pair of a symbol (to indicate the case) and a payload with the actual value. We can model this by using the canonical isomorphisms

$$? + ? \cong ((1 + 1) \times ?) \quad \underline{?} \& \underline{?} \cong (1 + 1) \rightarrow \underline{?}$$

and representing sums as pairs, and lazy products as functions. The fact that isomorphisms are ep pairs is useful for constructing the ep pairs needed in the dynamic type interpretation.

LEMMA 4.14 (ISOMORPHISMS ARE EP PAIRS). *If $x : A \vdash V' : A'$ and $x' : A' \vdash V : A$ are an isomorphism in that $V[V'/x'] \sqsubseteq x$ and $V[V/x] \sqsubseteq x'$, then $(x.V', \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } V')$ are a value ep pair from A to A' . Similarly if $\bullet : \underline{B} \vdash S' : \underline{B}'$ and $\bullet : \underline{B}' \vdash S : \underline{B}$ are an isomorphism in that $S[S'] \equiv \bullet$ and $S'[S] \equiv \bullet$ then $(z.S'[\text{force } z], S)$ is an ep pair from \underline{B} to \underline{B}' .*

With this in mind, we remove the cases for sums and lazy pairs from the natural dynamic types, and include some atomic type as a case of $?$ —for simplicity we will

just use booleans. We also do not need a case for 1, because we can identify it with one of the booleans, say true. This leads to the following definition:

Definition 4.15 (Scheme-like Dynamic Type Interpretation). We can define a dynamic type interpretation with the following type isomorphisms:

$$? \cong (1 + 1) + U_{\underline{?}} + (? \times ?) \qquad \underline{?} \cong (? \rightarrow \underline{?}) \& \underline{F?}$$

PROOF. We construct $?, \underline{?}$ explicitly as follows.

First define $X : \text{val type} \vdash \text{Tree}[X]$ val type to be the type of binary trees:

$$\text{Tree} = \mu X'. X + (X' \times X')$$

Next, define $X : \text{val type}, \underline{Y} : \text{ctype} \vdash \text{VarArg}[X, \underline{Y}]$ comp type to be the type of variable-arity functions from X to \underline{Y} :

$$\text{VarArg} = \nu \underline{Y}'. \underline{Y} \& (X \rightarrow \underline{Y}')$$

Then we define an open version of $?, \underline{?}$ with respect to a variable representing the occurrences of $?$ in $\underline{?}$:

$$X \text{ val type} \vdash ?_o = \text{Tree}[(1 + 1) + U_{\underline{?}_o}] \text{ comp type}$$

$$X \text{ val type} \vdash \underline{?}_o = \text{VarArg}[\underline{FX}/\underline{Y}] \text{ comp type}$$

Then we can define the closed versions using a recursive type:

$$? = \mu X. ?_o \qquad \underline{?} = \underline{?}_o[?]$$

The ep pairs for $\times, U, F, \rightarrow$ are clear. To define the rest, first note that there is an ep pair from $1 + 1$ to $?$ by Lemma 4.7. Next, we can define 1 to be the ep pair to $1 + 1$ defined by the left case and Lemma 4.7, composed with this. The ep pair for $? + ?$ is defined by composing the isomorphism (which is always an ep pair) $(? + ?) \cong ((1 + 1) \times ?)$ with the ep pair for $1 + 1$ using the action of product types on ep pairs (proven as part of Theorem 4.23): $(? + ?) \cong ((1 + 1) \times ?) \triangleleft (? \times ?) \triangleleft ?$ (where we write $A \triangleleft A'$ to mean there is an ep pair from A to A'). Similarly, for $\underline{?} \& \underline{?}$, we use action of the function type on ep pairs (also proven as part of Theorem 4.23): $\underline{?} \& \underline{?} \cong ((1 + 1) \rightarrow \underline{?}) \triangleleft (? \rightarrow \underline{?}) \triangleleft \underline{?}$ \square

If we factor out some of the recursion to use inductive and coinductive types, we get the following isomorphisms:

$$? \cong \text{Tree}[(1 + 1) + U_{\underline{?}}] \qquad \underline{?} \cong \text{VarArg}[?][\underline{F?}]$$

That is a dynamically typed value is a binary tree whose leaves are either booleans or closures. We think of this as a simple type of S-expressions. A dynamically typed computation is a variable-arity function that is called with some number of dynamically typed value arguments $?$ and returns a dynamically typed result

\underline{F} ?. This captures precisely the function type of Scheme, which allows for variable arity functions!

What's least clear is *why* the type

$$\text{VarArg}[X][\underline{Y}] = \nu \underline{Y}'. (X \rightarrow \underline{Y}') \& \underline{Y}$$

Should be thought of as a type of variable arity functions. First consider the infinite unrolling of this type:

$$\text{VarArg}[X][\underline{Y}] \simeq \underline{Y} \& (X \rightarrow \underline{Y}) \& (X \rightarrow X \rightarrow \underline{Y}) \& \dots$$

this says that a term of type $\text{VarArg}[X][\underline{Y}]$ offers an infinite number of possible behaviors: it can act as a function from $X^n \rightarrow \underline{Y}$ for any n . Similarly in Scheme, a function can be called with any number of arguments. Finally note that this type is isomorphic to a function that takes a *cons-list* of arguments:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underline{Y} \& (X \rightarrow \underline{Y}) \& (X \rightarrow X \rightarrow \underline{Y}) \& \dots \\ & \cong (1 \rightarrow \underline{Y}) \& ((X \times 1) \rightarrow \underline{Y}) \& ((X \times X \times 1) \rightarrow \underline{Y}) \& \dots \\ & \cong (1 + (X \times 1) + (X \times X \times 1) + \dots) \rightarrow \underline{Y} \\ & \cong (\mu X'. 1 + (X \times X')) \rightarrow \underline{Y} \end{aligned}$$

But operationally the type $\text{VarArg}[?][\underline{F}]$ is a more faithful model of Scheme implementations because all of the arguments are passed individually on the stack, whereas the type $(\mu X. 1 + (? \times X)) \rightarrow \underline{F}X$ is a function that takes a single argument that is a list. These two are distinguished in Scheme and the “dot args” notation witnesses the isomorphism.

Based on this dynamic type interpretation we can make a “Scheme-like” extension to GTT in Figure 8. First, we add a boolean type \mathbb{B} with *true*, *false* and *if-then-else*. Next, we add in the elimination form for $?$ and the introduction form for $\underline{\zeta}$. The elimination form for $?$ is a typed version of Scheme’s *match* macro. The introduction form for $\underline{\zeta}$ is a typed, CBPV version of Scheme’s *case-lambda* construct. Finally, we add type dynamism rules expressing the representations of 1 , $A + A$, and $A \times A$ in terms of booleans that were explicit in the ep pairs used in Definition 4.15.

The reader may be surprised by how *few* axioms we need to add to GTT for this extension: for instance we only define the upcast from 1 to \mathbb{B} and not vice-versa, and similarly the sum/lazy pair type isomorphisms only have one cast defined when a priori there are 4 to be defined. Finally for the dynamic types we define β and η laws that use the ground casts as injections and projections respectively, but we don’t define the corresponding dual casts (the ones that possibly error).

In fact all of these expected axioms can be *proven* from those we have shown. Again we see the surprising rigidity of GTT: because an \underline{F} downcast is determined by its dual value upcast (and vice-versa for U upcasts), we only need to define the upcast as long as the downcast *could* be implemented already. Because we give the

$$\begin{array}{c}
1 \sqsubseteq \mathbb{B} \qquad A + A \sqsubseteq \mathbb{B} \times A \qquad \underline{B} \& \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \underline{B} \\
\\
\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \text{true}, \text{false} : \mathbb{B}} \text{BI} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash V : \mathbb{B} \quad \Gamma \vdash E_t : T \quad \Gamma \vdash E_f : T}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \text{if } V \text{ then } E_t \text{ else } E_f : T} \text{BE} \\
\\
\text{if true then } E_t \text{ else } E_f \sqsubseteq E_t \qquad \text{if false then } E_t \text{ else } E_f \sqsubseteq E_f \\
\\
x : \mathbb{B} \vdash E \sqsubseteq \text{if } x \text{ then } E[\text{true}/x] \text{ else } E[\text{false}/x] \\
\\
\langle \mathbb{B} \hookrightarrow 1 \rangle V \sqsubseteq \text{true} \qquad \langle \mathbb{B} \times A \hookrightarrow A + A \rangle \text{inl } V \sqsubseteq (\text{true}, V) \\
\\
\langle \mathbb{B} \times A \hookrightarrow A + A \rangle \text{inr } V \sqsubseteq (\text{false}, V) \\
\\
\pi \langle \underline{B} \& \underline{B} \hookleftarrow \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \underline{B} \rangle M \sqsubseteq M \text{ true} \qquad \pi' \langle \underline{B} \& \underline{B} \hookleftarrow \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \underline{B} \rangle M \sqsubseteq M \text{ false} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M_{\rightarrow} : ? \rightarrow \underline{\zeta} \quad \Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M_{\underline{F}} : \underline{F} ?}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \{(\rightarrow) \mapsto M_{\rightarrow} \mid \underline{F} \mapsto M_{\underline{F}}\} : \underline{\zeta}} \underline{\zeta}^I \\
\\
\langle \underline{G} \hookleftarrow \underline{\zeta} \rangle \{(\rightarrow) \mapsto M_{\rightarrow} \mid \underline{F} \mapsto M_{\underline{F}}\} \sqsubseteq M_{\underline{G}} \quad (\underline{\zeta}\beta) \\
\\
\bullet : \underline{\zeta} \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \{(\rightarrow) \mapsto \langle ? \rightarrow \underline{\zeta} \hookleftarrow \underline{\zeta} \rangle \bullet \mid \underline{F} \mapsto \langle \underline{F} ? \hookleftarrow \underline{\zeta} \rangle \bullet\} \quad (\underline{\zeta}\eta) \\
\\
\hline
\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash V : ? \quad \Gamma, x_{\mathbb{B}} : \mathbb{B} \mid \Delta \vdash E_{\mathbb{B}} : T \quad \Gamma, x_U : U_{\underline{\zeta}} \mid \Delta \vdash E_U : T \quad \Gamma, x_{\times} : ? \times ? \mid \Delta \vdash E_{\times} : T \\
\\
\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash \text{tycase } V \{x_{\mathbb{B}}.E_{\mathbb{B}} \mid x_U.E_U \mid x_{\times}.E_{\times}\} : T \\
\\
\frac{G \in \{\mathbb{B}, \times, U\}}{\text{tycase } (\langle ? \hookrightarrow G \rangle V) \{x_{\mathbb{B}}.E_{\mathbb{B}} \mid x_U.E_U \mid x_{\times}.E_{\times}\} \sqsubseteq E_G[V/x_G]} \quad (? \beta) \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, x : ? \mid \Delta \vdash E : \underline{B}}{E \sqsubseteq \text{tycase } x \{x_{\mathbb{B}}.E[\langle ? \hookrightarrow \mathbb{B} \rangle / x_{\mathbb{B}}] \mid x_{\times}.E[\langle ? \hookrightarrow \times \rangle / x_{\times}] \mid x_U.E[\langle ? \hookrightarrow U \rangle / x_U]\} \quad ? \eta}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 8. Scheme-like Extension to GTT

dynamic types the universal property of a sum/lazy product type respectively, we can derive the implementations of the “checking” casts. All of the proofs are direct from the uniqueness of adjoints lemma.

THEOREM 4.16 (BOOLEAN TO UNIT DOWNCAST). *In Scheme-like GTT, we can prove*

$$\langle \underline{F1} \hookleftarrow \underline{FB} \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; \text{if } x \text{ then ret } () \text{ else } \mathbb{U}$$

THEOREM 4.17 (TAGGED VALUE TO SUM). *In Scheme-like GTT, we can prove*

$$\langle A + A \prec_{\mathbb{B}} \mathbb{B} \times A \rangle V \sqsubseteq \text{split } V \text{ to } (x, y). \text{if } x \text{ then inl } y \text{ else inr } y$$

and the downcasts are given by lemma 4.14.

THEOREM 4.18 (LAZY PRODUCT TO TAG CHECKING FUNCTION). *In Scheme-like GTT, we can prove*

$$\langle \mathbb{B} \rightarrow \underline{B} \prec \underline{B} \& \underline{B} \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \lambda x : \mathbb{B}. \text{if } x \text{ then } \pi \bullet \text{ else } \pi' \bullet$$

and the upcasts are given by lemma 4.14.

THEOREM 4.19 (GROUND MISMATCHES ARE ERRORS). *In Scheme-like GTT we can prove*

$$\langle \underline{F} \mathbb{B} \prec \underline{F} ? \rangle \text{ret } V \sqsubseteq \text{tycase } V \{x_{\mathbb{B}}. \text{ret } x_{\mathbb{B}} \mid \text{else } \mathbb{U}\}$$

$$\langle \underline{F} (? \times ?) \prec \underline{F} ? \rangle \text{ret } V \sqsubseteq \text{tycase } V \{x_{\times}. \text{ret } x_{\times} \mid \text{else } \mathbb{U}\}$$

$$\langle \underline{F} U_{\underline{U}} \prec \underline{F} ? \rangle \text{ret } V \sqsubseteq \text{tycase } V \{x_U. \text{ret } x_U \mid \text{else } \mathbb{U}\}$$

$$\text{force } \langle U_{\underline{U}} \prec U (? \rightarrow \underline{U}) \rangle V \sqsubseteq \{(\rightarrow) \mapsto \text{force } V \mid \underline{F} \mapsto \mathbb{U}\}$$

$$\text{force } \langle U_{\underline{U}} \prec U \underline{F} ? \rangle V \sqsubseteq \{(\rightarrow) \mapsto \mathbb{U} \mid \underline{F} \mapsto \text{force } V\}$$

Finally, we note now that all of these axioms are satisfied when using the Scheme-like dynamic type interpretation and extending the translation of GTT into CBPV* with the following, tediously explicit definition:

$$\llbracket \mathbb{B} \rrbracket = 1 + 1$$

$$\llbracket \text{true} \rrbracket = \text{inl } ()$$

$$\llbracket \text{false} \rrbracket = \text{inr } ()$$

$$\llbracket \text{if } V \text{ then } E_t \text{ else } E_f \rrbracket = \text{case } \llbracket V \rrbracket \{x. E_t \mid x. E_f\}$$

$$\llbracket \text{tycase } x \{x_{\mathbb{B}}. E_{\mathbb{B}} \mid x_U. E_U \mid x_{\times}. E_{\times}\} \rrbracket =$$

$$\text{unroll } (x : ?) \text{ to roll } x'. \text{unroll } x' : \text{Tree}[(1 + 1) + U_{\underline{U}}] \text{ to roll } t. \text{case } t$$

$$\{l. \text{case } l \{x_{\mathbb{B}}. \llbracket E_{\mathbb{B}} \rrbracket \mid x_U. \llbracket E_U \rrbracket\}$$

$$\mid x_{\times}. \llbracket E_{\times} \rrbracket\}$$

$$\llbracket \{(\rightarrow) \mapsto M_{\rightarrow} \mid \underline{F} \mapsto M_{\underline{F}}\} \rrbracket = \text{roll}_{v_{\underline{Y}}.(? \rightarrow \underline{Y}) \& \underline{F} ?} \{\pi \mapsto \llbracket M_{\rightarrow} \rrbracket \mid \pi' \mapsto \llbracket M_{\underline{F}} \rrbracket\}$$

4.3 Contract Translation

Having defined the data parameterizing the translation, we now consider the translation of GTT into CBPV* itself. For the remainder of the paper, we assume that we have a fixed dynamic type interpretation ρ , and all proofs and definitions work for any interpretation.

4.3.1 Interpreting Casts as Contracts. The main idea of the translation is an extension of the dynamic type interpretation to an interpretation of *all* casts in GTT (Figure 9) as contracts in CBPV*, following the definitions in Lemma 3.25. Some clauses of the translation are overlapping, which we resolve by considering them as ordered (though we will ultimately show they are equivalent). The definition is also not obviously total: we need to verify that it covers every possible case where $A \sqsubseteq A'$ and $B \sqsubseteq B'$. To prove totality and coherence, we could try induction on the type dynamism relation of Figure 2, but it is convenient to first give an alternative, normalized set of rules for type dynamism that proves the same relations, which we do in Figure 10.

LEMMA 4.20 (NORMALIZED TYPE DYNAMISM IS EQUIVALENT TO ORIGINAL). *$T \sqsubseteq T'$ is provable in the normalized typed dynamism definition iff it is provable in the original typed dynamism definition.*

PROOF. It is clear that the normalized system is a subset of the original: every normalized rule corresponds directly to a rule of the original system, except the normalized $A \sqsubseteq ?$ and $B \sqsubseteq \underline{\iota}$ rules have a subderivation that was not present originally.

For the converse, first we show by induction that reflexivity is admissible:

- (1) If $A \in \{?, 1, 0\}$, we use a normalized rule.
- (2) If $A \notin \{?, 1, 0\}$, we use the inductive hypothesis and the monotonicity rule.
- (3) If $B \in \{\underline{\iota}, \top\}$ use the normalized rule.
- (4) If $B \notin \{\underline{\iota}, \top\}$ use the inductive hypothesis and monotonicity rule.

Next, we show that transitivity is admissible:

- (1) Assume we have $A \sqsubseteq A' \sqsubseteq A''$
 - (a) If the left rule is $0 \sqsubseteq A'$, then either $A' = ?$ or $A' = 0$. If $A' = 0$ the right rule is $0 \sqsubseteq A''$ and we can use that proof. Otherwise, $A' = ?$ then the right rule is $? \sqsubseteq ?$ and we can use $0 \sqsubseteq ?$.
 - (b) If the left rule is $A \sqsubseteq A$ where $A \in \{?, 1\}$ then either $A = ?$, in which case $A'' = ?$ and we're done. Otherwise the right rule is either $1 \sqsubseteq 1$ (done) or $1 \sqsubseteq ?$ (also done).
 - (c) If the left rule is $A \sqsubseteq ?$ with $A \notin \{0, ?\}$ then the right rule must be $? \sqsubseteq ?$ and we're done.
 - (d) Otherwise the left rule is a monotonicity rule for one of $U, +, \times$ and the right rule is either monotonicity (use the inductive hypothesis) or the right rule

$$\begin{array}{ll}
x : \llbracket A \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket : \llbracket A' \rrbracket & \bullet : \llbracket B' \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle B \leftarrow B' \rangle \rrbracket : \llbracket B \rrbracket \\
\\
x : 0 \vdash \llbracket \langle A \hookrightarrow 0 \rangle \rrbracket & = \text{absurd } x \\
\bullet : A \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{F}0 \leftarrow \underline{F}A \rangle \rrbracket & = \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; \mathcal{U} \\
x : \llbracket ? \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle ? \hookrightarrow ? \rangle \rrbracket & = x \\
\bullet : \underline{F}? \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{F}? \leftarrow \underline{F}? \rangle \rrbracket & = \bullet \\
x : \llbracket G \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle ? \hookrightarrow G \rangle \rrbracket & = \rho_{up}(G) \\
\bullet : \underline{F}? \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{F}G \leftarrow \underline{F}? \rangle \rrbracket & = \rho_{dn}(G) \\
x : \llbracket A \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle ? \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket & = \llbracket \langle ? \hookrightarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \langle \llbracket A \rrbracket \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket / x \rrbracket \\
\bullet : \underline{F}? \vdash \llbracket \langle A \leftarrow ? \rangle \rrbracket & = \llbracket \langle A \leftarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \langle \llbracket A \rrbracket \leftarrow ? \rangle \rrbracket \rrbracket \\
x : \llbracket A_1 \rrbracket + \llbracket A_2 \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rrbracket & = \text{case } x \\
& \quad \{x_1. \llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [x_1/x] \mid x_2. \llbracket \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x_2/x]\} \\
\bullet : \llbracket A_1 \rrbracket + \llbracket A_2 \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 + A'_2) \rangle \rrbracket & = \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{case } x' \\
& \quad \{x'_1. \text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow (\llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \rrbracket \text{ret } x'_1) \mid x'_2. \text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow (\llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_2 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \text{ret } x'_2)\} \\
x : 1 \vdash \llbracket \langle 1 \hookrightarrow 1 \rangle \rrbracket & = x \\
\bullet : \underline{F}1 \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{F}1 \leftarrow \underline{F}1 \rangle \rrbracket & = x \\
x : \llbracket A_1 \rrbracket \times \llbracket A_2 \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle A'_1 \times A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_1 \times A_2 \rangle \rrbracket & = \text{split } x \text{ to } (x_1, x_2). \\
& \quad (\llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [x_1], \llbracket \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x_2]) \\
\bullet \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{F}(A_1 \times A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 \times A'_2) \rangle \rrbracket & = \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } x' \text{ to } (x'_1, x'_2). \\
& \quad \text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \rrbracket \text{ret } x'_1; \\
& \quad \text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_2 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \text{ret } x'_2; \text{ret } x \\
x : U \llbracket A \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle U \underline{F}A' \hookrightarrow U \underline{F}A \rangle \rrbracket & = \text{thunk (bind } y \leftarrow \text{force } x; \text{ret } \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket) \\
\\
\bullet : \underline{B} \vdash \llbracket \langle \top \leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket & = \{\} \\
x : U \top \vdash \llbracket \langle U \underline{B} \hookrightarrow U \top \rangle \rrbracket & = \text{thunk } \mathcal{U} \\
\bullet : \underline{i} \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{i} \leftarrow \underline{i} \rangle \rrbracket & = \bullet \\
x : U \underline{i} \vdash \llbracket \langle U \underline{i} \hookrightarrow U \underline{i} \rangle \rrbracket & = x \\
\bullet : \underline{i} \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{G} \leftarrow \underline{i} \rangle \rrbracket & = \rho_{dn}(\underline{G}) \\
x : U \underline{G} \vdash \llbracket \langle U \underline{i} \hookrightarrow U \underline{G} \rangle \rrbracket & = \rho_{up}(\underline{G}) \\
\bullet : \underline{i} \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{i} \rangle \rrbracket & = \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \llbracket \underline{B} \rrbracket \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \langle \llbracket \underline{B} \rrbracket \leftarrow \underline{i} \rangle \rrbracket \rrbracket \\
x : U \underline{i} \vdash \llbracket \langle U \underline{i} \hookrightarrow U \underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket & = \llbracket \langle U \underline{i} \hookrightarrow U \llbracket \underline{B} \rrbracket \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \langle U \llbracket \underline{B} \rrbracket \hookrightarrow U \underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket \rrbracket \\
\bullet : \llbracket B'_1 \rrbracket \& \llbracket B'_2 \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket & = \{\pi \mapsto \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \rangle \rrbracket \pi \bullet \mid \pi' \mapsto \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \pi' \bullet\} \\
x : U(\llbracket B_1 \rrbracket \& \llbracket B_2 \rrbracket) \vdash \llbracket \langle U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \hookrightarrow U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \rangle \rrbracket & = \text{thunk} \\
& \quad \{\pi \mapsto \text{force } \llbracket \langle \underline{B}'_1 \hookrightarrow \underline{B}_1 \rangle \rrbracket (\text{thunk } \pi \text{ for } \pi') \mid \pi' \mapsto \text{force } \llbracket \langle \underline{B}'_2 \hookrightarrow \underline{B}_2 \rangle \rrbracket (\text{thunk } \pi' \text{ for } \pi)\} \\
\bullet \vdash \llbracket \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket & = \lambda x : A. \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket (\bullet (\llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket x)) \\
f : U(\llbracket A \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket B \rrbracket) \vdash \llbracket \langle U(A' \rightarrow \underline{B}') \hookrightarrow U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \rangle \rrbracket & = \text{thunk } \lambda x' : A'. \\
& \quad \text{bind } x \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A \leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle \rrbracket \text{ret } x'; \\
& \quad \text{force } \llbracket \langle U \underline{B}' \hookrightarrow U \underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket \text{thunk (force } f) \\
\bullet : \underline{F} \underline{B}' \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{F} \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{F} \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket & = \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \text{force } x'
\end{array}$$

Fig. 9. Cast to Contract Translation

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{A \in \{?, 1\}}{A \sqsubseteq A} \qquad \frac{A \in \{?, 0\}}{0 \sqsubseteq A} \qquad \frac{A \sqsubseteq [A] \quad A \notin \{0, ?\}}{A \sqsubseteq ?} \\
\\
\frac{\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'}{UB \sqsubseteq UB'} \qquad \frac{A_1 \sqsubseteq A'_1 \quad A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_2}{A_1 + A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_1 + A'_2} \qquad \frac{A_1 \sqsubseteq A'_1 \quad A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_2}{A_1 \times A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_1 \times A'_2} \\
\\
\underline{\iota} \sqsubseteq \underline{\iota} \qquad \frac{\underline{B} \in \{\underline{\iota}, \top\}}{\top \sqsubseteq \underline{B}} \qquad \frac{\underline{B} \sqsubseteq [\underline{B}] \quad \underline{B} \notin \{\top, \underline{\iota}\}}{\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{\iota}} \\
\\
\frac{A \sqsubseteq A'}{\underline{FA} \sqsubseteq \underline{FA}'} \qquad \frac{\underline{B}_1 \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_1 \quad \underline{B}_2 \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_2}{\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2} \qquad \frac{A \sqsubseteq A' \quad \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'}{A \rightarrow \underline{B} \sqsubseteq A' \rightarrow \underline{B}'}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 10. Normalized Type Dynamism Relation

is $A' \sqsubseteq ?$ with a sub-proof of $A' \sqsubseteq [A']$. Since the left rule is monotonicity, $[A] = [A']$, so we inductively use transitivity of the proof of $A \sqsubseteq A'$ with the proof of $A' \sqsubseteq [A']$ to get a proof $A \sqsubseteq [A]$ and thus $A \sqsubseteq ?$.

(2) Assume we have $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}' \sqsubseteq \underline{B}''$.

- (a) If the left rule is $\top \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$ then $\underline{B}'' \in \{\underline{\iota}, \top\}$ so we apply that rule.
- (b) If the left rule is $\underline{\iota} \sqsubseteq \underline{\iota}$, the right rule must be as well.
- (c) If the left rule is $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{\iota}$ the right rule must be reflexivity.
- (d) If the left rule is a monotonicity rule for $\&$, \rightarrow , \underline{F} then the right rule is either also monotonicity (use the inductive hypothesis) or it's a $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{\iota}$ rule and we proceed with ? above

Finally we show $A \sqsubseteq ?$, $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{\iota}$ are admissible by induction on A , \underline{B} .

- (1) If $A \in \{?, 0\}$ we use the primitive rule.
- (2) If $A \notin \{?, 0\}$ we use the $A \sqsubseteq ?$ rule and we need to show $A \sqsubseteq [A]$. If $A = 1$, we use the $1 \sqsubseteq 1$ rule, otherwise we use the inductive hypothesis and monotonicity.
- (3) If $\underline{B} \in \{\underline{\iota}, \top\}$ we use the primitive rule.
- (4) If $\underline{B} \notin \{\underline{\iota}, \top\}$ we use the $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{\iota}$ rule and we need to show $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq [\underline{B}]$, which follows by inductive hypothesis and monotonicity.

Every other rule in Figure 2 is a rule of the normalized system in Figure 10. \square

Based on normalized type dynamism, we show

THEOREM 4.21. *If $A \sqsubseteq A'$ according to Figure 10, then there is a unique complex value $x : A \vdash \llbracket \langle A' \prec A \rangle \rrbracket x : A'$ and if $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$ according to Figure 10, then there is a unique complex stack $x : \underline{B} \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{B}' \prec \underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket x : \underline{B}'$*

4.3.2 Interpretation of Terms. Next, we extend the translation of casts to a translation of all terms by congruence, since all terms in GTT besides casts are in CBPV*. This satisfies:

LEMMA 4.22 (CONTRACT TRANSLATION TYPE PRESERVATION). *If $\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash E : T$ in GTT, then $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \mid \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket E \rrbracket : \llbracket T \rrbracket$ in CBPV*.*

4.3.3 Interpretation of Term Dynamism. We have now given an interpretation of the types, terms, and type dynamism proofs of GTT in CBPV*. To complete this to form a *model* of GTT, we need to give an interpretation of the *term dynamism* proofs, which is established by the following “axiomatic graduality” theorem. GTT has *heterogeneous* term dynamism rules indexed by type dynamism, but CBPV* has only *homogeneous* inequalities between terms, i.e., if $E \sqsubseteq E'$, then E, E' have the *same* context and types. Since every type dynamism judgement has an associated contract, we can translate a heterogeneous term dynamism to a homogeneous inequality *up to contract*. Our next overall goal is to prove

THEOREM 4.23 (AXIOMATIC GRADUALITY). *For any dynamic type interpretation,*

$$\frac{\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma' \quad \Psi : \Delta \sqsubseteq \Delta' \quad \Phi \mid \Psi \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}}{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \mid \llbracket \Delta' \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket M \rrbracket \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket : \llbracket \underline{B} \rrbracket} \quad \frac{\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma' \quad \Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A \sqsubseteq A'}{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket V \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket V' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket :}$$

where we define $\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket$ to upcast each variable, and $\llbracket \Delta \rrbracket$ to downcast \bullet if it is nonempty, and if $\Delta = \cdot$, then $M[\llbracket \Delta \rrbracket] = M$. More explicitly,

- (1) If $\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma'$, then there exists n such that $\Gamma = x_1 : A_1, \dots, x_n : A_n$ and $\Gamma' = x'_1 : A'_1, \dots, x'_n : A'_n$ where $A_i \sqsubseteq A'_i$ for each $i \leq n$. Then $\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket$ is a substitution from $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket$ to $\llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket$ defined as

$$\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket = \llbracket \langle A'_1 \leftarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket x_1/x'_1, \dots, \llbracket \langle A'_n \leftarrow A_n \rangle \rrbracket x_n/x'_n$$

- (2) If $\Psi : \Delta \sqsubseteq \Delta'$, then we similarly define $\llbracket \Psi \rrbracket$ as a “linear substitution”. That is, if $\Delta = \Delta' = \cdot$, then $\llbracket \Psi \rrbracket$ is an empty substitution and $M[\llbracket \Psi \rrbracket] = M$, otherwise $\llbracket \Psi \rrbracket$ is a linear substitution from $\Delta' = \bullet : \underline{B}'$ to $\Delta = \bullet : \underline{B}$ where $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$ defined as

$$\llbracket \Psi \rrbracket = \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \bullet / \bullet$$

Relative to previous work on graduality [New and Ahmed 2018], the distinction between complex value upcasts and complex stack downcasts guides the formulation of the theorem; e.g. using upcasts in the left-hand theorem would require more thunks/forces.

We now develop some lemmas on the way towards proving this result. First, to keep proofs high-level, we establish the following cast reductions that follow easily from β, η principles.

LEMMA 4.24 (CAST REDUCTIONS). *The following are all provable*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \llbracket \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{inl } V] \sqsubseteq \text{inl } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [V] \\
& \llbracket \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{inr } V] \sqsubseteq \text{inr } \llbracket \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [V] \\
& \llbracket \langle \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 + A'_2) \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret inl } V] \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle A_1 \leftarrow A'_1 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } V]; \text{ret inl } x_1 \\
& \llbracket \langle \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 + A'_2) \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret inr } V] \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle A_2 \leftarrow A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } V]; \text{ret inr } x_2 \\
& \llbracket \langle \underline{F}1 \leftarrow \underline{F}1 \rangle \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \bullet \\
& \llbracket \langle 1 \hookrightarrow 1 \rangle \rrbracket [x] \sqsubseteq x \\
& \llbracket \langle \underline{F}(A_1 \times A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 \times A'_2) \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } (V_1, V_2)] \\
& \quad \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } V_1]; \text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_2 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } V_2]; \text{ret } (x_1, x_2) \\
& \llbracket \langle A'_1 \times A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_1 \times A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [(V_1, V_2)] \sqsubseteq (\llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [V_1], \llbracket \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [V_2]) \\
& (\llbracket \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket M) V \sqsubseteq (\llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket M) (\llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket V) \\
& (\text{force } (\llbracket \langle U(A' \rightarrow \underline{B}') \hookrightarrow U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \rangle \rrbracket V)) V' \\
& \quad \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A \leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } V']; \text{force } (\llbracket \langle \underline{U}\underline{B}' \hookrightarrow \underline{U}\underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket (\text{thunk } (\text{force } V x))) \\
& \pi \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket M \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \rangle \rrbracket \pi M \\
& \pi' \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket M \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \pi' M \\
& \pi \text{force } (\llbracket \langle \underline{U}(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \hookrightarrow \underline{U}(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \rangle \rrbracket V) \sqsubseteq \text{force } \llbracket \langle \underline{U}\underline{B}'_1 \hookrightarrow \underline{U}\underline{B}_1 \rangle \rrbracket \text{thunk } (\pi \text{force } V) \\
& \pi' \text{force } (\llbracket \langle \underline{U}(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \hookrightarrow \underline{U}(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \rangle \rrbracket V) \sqsubseteq \text{force } \llbracket \langle \underline{U}\underline{B}'_2 \hookrightarrow \underline{U}\underline{B}_2 \rangle \rrbracket \text{thunk } (\pi' \text{force } V) \\
& \llbracket \langle \underline{F}\underline{U}\underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{F}\underline{U}\underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } V] \sqsubseteq \text{ret thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \text{force } V \\
& \text{force } \llbracket \langle \underline{U}\underline{F}A' \hookrightarrow \underline{U}\underline{F}A \rangle \rrbracket [V] \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } V; \text{thunk ret } \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x
\end{aligned}$$

Our next goal is to show that from the basic casts being ep pairs, we can prove that all casts as defined in Figure 9 are ep pairs. Before doing so, we prove the following lemma, which is used for transitivity (e.g. in the $A \sqsubseteq ?$ rule, which uses a composition $A \sqsubseteq [A] \sqsubseteq ?$):

LEMMA 4.25 (EP PAIRS COMPOSE).

- (1) If (V_1, S_1) is a value ep pair from A_1 to A_2 and (V_2, S_2) is a value ep pair from A_2 to A_3 , then $(V_2[V_1], S_1[S_2])$ is a value ep pair from A_1 to A_3 .
- (2) If (V_1, S_1) is a computation ep pair from \underline{B}_1 to \underline{B}_2 and (V_2, S_2) is a computation ep pair from \underline{B}_2 to \underline{B}_3 , then $(V_2[V_1], S_1[S_2])$ is a computation ep pair from \underline{B}_1 to \underline{B}_3 .

PROOF. (1) First, retraction follows from retraction twice:

$$S_1[S_2[\text{ret } V_2[V_1[x]]]] \sqsubseteq S_1[\text{ret } [V_1[x]]] \sqsubseteq x$$

and projection follows from projection twice:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{bind } x \leftarrow S_1[S_2[\bullet]]; \text{ret } V_2[V_1[x]] &\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow S_1[S_2[\bullet]]; \text{bind } y \leftarrow \text{ret } [V_1[x]]; \text{ret } V_2[y] \\
 &\quad (F\beta) \\
 &\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow (\text{bind } x \leftarrow S_1[S_2[\bullet]]; \text{ret } [V_1[x]]); \text{ret } V_2[y] \\
 &\quad (\text{Commuting conversion}) \\
 &\sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow S_2[\bullet]; \text{ret } V_2[y] \quad (\text{Projection}) \\
 &\sqsubseteq \bullet \quad (\text{Projection})
 \end{aligned}$$

(2) Again retraction follows from retraction twice:

$$S_1[S_2[\text{force } V_2[V_1[z]]]] \sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq S_1[\text{force } V_1[z]] \sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{force } z$$

and projection from projection twice:

$$\begin{aligned}
 V_2[V_1[\text{thunk } S_1[S_2[\text{force } w]]]] &\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq V_2[V_1[\text{thunk } S_1[\text{force } \text{thunk } S_2[\text{force } w]]]] \\
 &\quad (U\beta) \\
 &\sqsubseteq V_2[\text{thunk } S_2[\text{force } w]] \quad (\text{Projection}) \\
 &\sqsubseteq w \quad (\text{Projection})
 \end{aligned}$$

□

LEMMA 4.26 (IDENTITY EP PAIR). $(x.x, \bullet)$ is an ep pair (value or computation).

Now, we show that all casts are ep pairs. The proof is a somewhat tedious, but straightforward calculation.

LEMMA 4.27 (CASTS ARE EP PAIRS).

- (1) For any $A \sqsubseteq A'$, the casts $(x. \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x \rrbracket, \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A \hookleftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle \rrbracket)$ are a value ep pair from $\llbracket A \rrbracket$ to $\llbracket A' \rrbracket$
- (2) For any $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$, the casts $(z. \llbracket \langle \underline{U}\underline{B}' \hookrightarrow \underline{U}\underline{B} \rangle z \rrbracket, \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \hookleftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket)$ are a computation ep pair from $\llbracket \underline{B} \rrbracket$ to $\llbracket \underline{B}' \rrbracket$.

PROOF. By induction on normalized type dynamism derivations.

(1) $A \sqsubseteq A$ ($A \in \{?, 1\}$), because identity is an ep pair.

(2) $0 \sqsubseteq A$ (that $A \in \{?, 0\}$ is not important):

(a) Retraction is

$$x : 0 \vdash \text{ret } x \sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow \text{ret } \text{absurd } x; \bar{U} : \underline{F}A$$

which holds by 0η

(b) Projection is

$$\bullet : \underline{F}A \vdash \text{bind } x \leftarrow (\text{bind } y \leftarrow \bullet; \bar{U}); \text{ret } \text{absurd } x \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{F}A$$

Which we calculate:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{bind } x \leftarrow (\text{bind } y \leftarrow \bullet; \mathcal{U}); \text{ret absurd } x \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow \bullet; \text{bind } x \leftarrow \mathcal{U}; \text{ret absurd } x && (\text{comm conv}) \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow \bullet; \mathcal{U} && (\text{Strictness of Stacks}) \\
& \sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } y && (\mathcal{U} \text{ is } \perp) \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \bullet && (F\eta)
\end{aligned}$$

(3) +:

(a) Retraction is

$$\begin{aligned}
& x : A_1 + A_2 \vdash \\
& \llbracket \langle \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2) \llcorner \underline{F}(A'_1 + A'_2) \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \rightsquigarrow A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x]] \\
& = \llbracket \langle \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2) \llcorner \underline{F}(A'_1 + A'_2) \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret case } x \{ x_1. \text{inl } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \rightsquigarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [x_1] \mid x_1. \text{inr } \llbracket \langle A'_2 \rightsquigarrow A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x_2] \}] \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{case } x && (\text{commuting conversion}) \\
& \quad \{ x_1. \llbracket \langle \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2) \llcorner \underline{F}(A'_1 + A'_2) \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret inl } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \rightsquigarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [x_1]] \\
& \quad \mid x_2. \llbracket \langle \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2) \llcorner \underline{F}(A'_1 + A'_2) \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret inr } \llbracket \langle A'_2 \rightsquigarrow A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x_2]] \} \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{case } x && (\text{cast computation}) \\
& \quad \{ x_1. \text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_1 \llcorner \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \rightsquigarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [x_1]]; \text{ret inl } x_1 \\
& \quad \mid x_2. \text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_2 \llcorner \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } \llbracket \langle A'_2 \rightsquigarrow A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x_2]]; \text{ret inr } x_2 \} \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{case } x \{ x_1. \text{ret inl } x_1 \mid x_2. \text{ret inr } x_2 \} && (\text{IH retraction}) \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{ret } x && (+\eta)
\end{aligned}$$

(b) For Projection:

• : $A'_1 + A'_2 \vdash$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{bind } x \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}(A_1 + A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 + A'_2) \rangle \rrbracket; \llbracket \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \prec A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rrbracket[x] \\
&= \text{bind } x \leftarrow (\text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{case } x' \{ x'_1.\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \rrbracket[\text{ret } x'_1]; \text{ret inl } x_1 \mid \\
&\quad \llbracket \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \prec A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rrbracket \\
&\sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; \text{case } x' \quad (\text{Commuting Conversion}) \\
&\quad \{ x'_1.\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \rrbracket[\text{ret } x'_1]; \llbracket \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \prec A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rrbracket \text{ret inl } x_1 \\
&\quad \mid x'_2.\text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_2 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket[\text{ret } x'_2]; \llbracket \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \prec A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rrbracket \text{ret inr } x_2 \} \\
&\sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; \text{case } x' \quad (\text{Cast Computation}) \\
&\quad \{ x'_1.\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \rrbracket[\text{ret } x'_1]; \text{ret inl } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \prec A_1 \rangle \rrbracket x_1 \\
&\quad \mid x'_2.\text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_2 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket[\text{ret } x'_2]; \text{ret inr } \llbracket \langle A'_2 \prec A_2 \rangle \rrbracket x_2 \} \\
&\sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; \text{case } x' \{ x'_1.\text{ret inl } x'_1 \mid x'_2.\text{ret inr } x'_2 \} \quad (\text{IH projection}) \\
&\sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } x' \quad (+\eta) \\
&\sqsubseteq \bullet \quad (F\eta)
\end{aligned}$$

(4) \times :

(a) First, Retraction:

$x : A_1 \times A_2 \vdash$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \llbracket \langle \underline{F}(A_1 \times A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 \times A'_2) \rangle \rrbracket[\text{ret } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \times A'_2 \prec A_1 \times A_2 \rangle \rrbracket[x]] \\
&= \llbracket \langle \underline{F}(A_1 \times A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 \times A'_2) \rangle \rrbracket[\text{ret split } x \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).(\llbracket \langle A'_1 \prec A_1 \rangle \rrbracket[x_1], \llbracket \langle A'_2 \prec A_2 \rangle \rrbracket[x_2])] \\
&\sqsubseteq \text{split } x \text{ to } (x_1, x_2). \llbracket \langle \underline{F}(A_1 \times A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 \times A'_2) \rangle \rrbracket[\text{ret } (\llbracket \langle A'_1 \prec A_1 \rangle \rrbracket[x_1], \llbracket \langle A'_2 \prec A_2 \rangle \rrbracket[x_2])] \\
&\quad (\text{commuting conversion}) \\
&\sqsubseteq \text{split } x \text{ to } (x_1, x_2). \quad (\text{cast reduction}) \\
&\quad \text{bind } y_1 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \rrbracket[\text{ret } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \prec A_1 \rangle \rrbracket[x_1]]; \\
&\quad \text{bind } y_2 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_2 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket[\text{ret } \llbracket \langle A'_2 \prec A_2 \rangle \rrbracket[x_2]]; \\
&\quad \text{ret } (y_1, y_2) \\
&\sqsubseteq \text{split } x \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).\text{bind } y_1 \leftarrow \text{ret } x_1; \text{bind } y_2 \leftarrow \text{ret } x_2; \text{ret } (y_1, y_2) \quad (\text{IH retraction}) \\
&\sqsubseteq \text{split } x \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).\text{ret } (x_1, x_2) \quad (F\beta) \\
&\sqsubseteq \text{ret } x \quad (\times\eta)
\end{aligned}$$

(b) Next, Projection:

• : $\underline{F}A' \vdash$

$\text{bind } x \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}(A_1 \times A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 \times A'_2) \rangle \rrbracket [\bullet]; \text{ret } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \times A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_1 \times A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x]$
 $\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } x' \text{ to } (x'_1, x'_2). \quad (F\eta, \times\eta)$

$\text{bind } x \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}(A_1 \times A_2) \leftarrow \underline{F}(A'_1 \times A'_2) \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } (x'_1, x'_2)];$
 $\text{ret } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \times A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_1 \times A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x]$
 $\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } x' \text{ to } (x'_1, x'_2). \quad (\text{cast reduction})$

$\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } x'_1];$
 $\text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_2 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } x'_2];$
 $\text{ret } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \times A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_1 \times A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [(x_1, x_2)]$
 $\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } x' \text{ to } (x'_1, x'_2). \quad (\text{cast reduction})$

$\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } x'_1];$
 $\text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_2 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } x'_2];$
 $\text{ret } (\llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [x_1], \llbracket \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x_2])$
 $\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } x' \text{ to } (x'_1, x'_2). \quad (F\beta, \text{ twice})$

$\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } x'_1];$
 $\text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_2 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } x'_2];$
 $\text{bind } y'_2 \leftarrow \text{ret } \llbracket \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x_2];$
 $\text{bind } y'_1 \leftarrow \text{ret } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [x_1];$
 $\text{ret } (y'_1, y'_2)$
 $\sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } x' \text{ to } (x'_1, x'_2). \quad (\text{IH Projection})$

$\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } x'_1];$
 $\text{bind } y'_2 \leftarrow \text{ret } x'_2;$
 $\text{bind } y'_1 \leftarrow \text{ret } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [x_1];$
 $\text{ret } (y'_1, y'_2)$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } x' \text{ to } (x'_1, x'_2). \quad (F\beta)$
 $\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A_1 \leftarrow \underline{F}A'_1 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } x'_1];$
 $\text{bind } y'_1 \leftarrow \text{ret } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [x_1];$
 $\text{ret } (x'_1, y'_2)$

$\sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } x' \text{ to } (x'_1, x'_2). \quad (\text{IH Projection})$
 $\text{bind } y'_1 \leftarrow \text{ret } x'_1;$
 $\text{ret } (x'_1, y'_2)$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{split } x' \text{ to } (x'_1, x'_2); \text{ret } (x'_1, x'_2) \quad (F\beta)$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } x' \quad (\times\eta)$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \bullet \quad (F\eta)$

(5) U : By inductive hypothesis, $(x. \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}' \rightsquigarrow U\underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket, \langle \underline{B} \llcorner \underline{B}' \rangle)$ is a computation ep pair

(a) To show retraction we need to prove:

$$x : U\underline{B} \vdash \text{ret } x \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow (\text{ret } \text{thunk } \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}' \rightsquigarrow U\underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket); \text{ret } \text{thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \llcorner \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } y]$$

Which we calculate as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x : U\underline{B} \vdash & \\ \llbracket \langle \underline{FUB} \llcorner \underline{FUB}' \rangle \rrbracket [(\text{ret } \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}' \rightsquigarrow U\underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket [x])] & \\ \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{ret } \text{thunk } (\llbracket \langle \underline{B} \llcorner \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}' \rightsquigarrow U\underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket [x]]) & \quad (\text{Cast Reduction}) \\ \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{ret } \text{thunk } \text{force } x & \quad (\text{IH Retraction}) \\ \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{ret } x & \quad (U\eta) \end{aligned}$$

(b) To show projection we calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{bind } x \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{FUB} \llcorner \underline{FUB}' \rangle \rrbracket [\bullet]; \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}' \rightsquigarrow U\underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket [x] & \\ \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{bind } x \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{FUB} \llcorner \underline{FUB}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } x']; \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}' \rightsquigarrow U\underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket [x] & \quad (F\eta) \\ \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } \text{thunk } (\llbracket \langle \underline{B} \llcorner \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } x']); \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}' \rightsquigarrow U\underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket [x] & \quad (\text{Cast Reduction}) \\ \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}' \rightsquigarrow U\underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } (\llbracket \langle \underline{B} \llcorner \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } x'])] & \quad (F\beta) \\ \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \bullet; x' & \quad (\text{IH Projection}) \\ \sqsubseteq \bullet & \quad (F\eta) \end{aligned}$$

(1) There's a few base cases about the dynamic computation type, then

(2) \top :

(a) Retraction is by $\top\eta$:

$$z : U\top \vdash \text{force } z \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \{\} : \top$$

(b) Projection is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{thunk } \top & \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \text{force } w & (\top \text{ is } \perp) \\ & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq w & (U\eta) \end{aligned}$$

(3) $\&$:

(a) Retraction

$$\begin{aligned}
& z : U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \vdash \\
& \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } \llbracket \langle U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \leftarrow U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \rangle \rrbracket [z]] \\
& \sqsubseteq \{ \pi \mapsto \pi \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } \llbracket \langle U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \leftarrow U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \rangle \rrbracket [z]] \} \\
& \hspace{15em} (\&\eta) \\
& \quad | \pi' \mapsto \pi' \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } \llbracket \langle U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \leftarrow U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \rangle \rrbracket [z]] \} \\
& \sqsubseteq \{ \pi \mapsto \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \rangle \rrbracket [\pi \text{force } \llbracket \langle U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \leftarrow U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \rangle \rrbracket [z]] \} \\
& \hspace{15em} (\text{Cast reduction}) \\
& \quad | \pi' \mapsto \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\pi' \text{force } \llbracket \langle U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \leftarrow U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \rangle \rrbracket [z]] \} \\
& \sqsubseteq \{ \pi \mapsto \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}'_1 \leftarrow U\underline{B}_1 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \pi \text{force } z]] \} \\
& \hspace{15em} (\text{Cast reduction}) \\
& \quad | \pi' \mapsto \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}'_2 \leftarrow U\underline{B}_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \pi' \text{force } z]] \} \\
& \sqsubseteq \{ \pi \mapsto \text{force thunk } \pi \text{force } z \mid \pi' \mapsto \text{force thunk } \pi' \text{force } z \} \\
& \hspace{15em} (\text{IH retraction}) \\
& \sqsubseteq \{ \pi \mapsto \pi \text{force } z \mid \pi' \mapsto \pi' \text{force } z \} \hspace{10em} (U\beta) \\
& \sqsubseteq \text{force } z \hspace{15em} (\&\eta)
\end{aligned}$$

(b) Projection

$$\begin{aligned}
& w : UB'_1 \& B'_2 \vdash \\
& \llbracket \langle U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \hookrightarrow U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \hookleftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } w]] \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk force } \llbracket \langle U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \hookrightarrow U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \hookleftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } w]] \\
& \hspace{15em} (U\eta) \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \{ \pi \mapsto \pi \text{force } \llbracket \langle U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \hookrightarrow U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \hookleftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } w]] \\
& \quad | \pi' \mapsto \pi' \text{force } \llbracket \langle U(\underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2) \hookrightarrow U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \hookleftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } w]] \} \\
& \hspace{15em} (\&\eta) \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \{ \pi \mapsto \text{force } \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}'_1 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_1 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \pi \text{force thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \hookleftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } w]] \\
& \quad | \pi' \mapsto \text{force } \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}'_2 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \pi' \text{force thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \hookleftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } w]] \} \\
& \hspace{15em} (\text{cast reduction}) \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \{ \pi \mapsto \text{force } \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}'_1 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_1 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \pi \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \hookleftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } w]] \\
& \hspace{15em} (U\beta) \\
& \quad | \pi' \mapsto \text{force } \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}'_2 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \pi' \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \hookleftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } w]] \} \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \{ \pi \mapsto \text{force } \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}'_1 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_1 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \hookleftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \rangle \rrbracket [\pi \text{force } w]] \\
& \hspace{15em} (\text{cast reduction}) \\
& \quad | \pi' \mapsto \text{force } \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}'_2 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_2 \hookleftarrow \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\pi' \text{force } w]] \} \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \{ \pi \mapsto \text{force } \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}'_1 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_1 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \hookleftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force thunk } \pi \text{force } w]] \\
& \hspace{15em} (U\beta) \\
& \quad | \pi' \mapsto \text{force } \llbracket \langle U\underline{B}'_2 \hookrightarrow U\underline{B}_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_2 \hookleftarrow \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force thunk } \pi' \text{force } w]] \} \\
& \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \{ \pi \mapsto \text{force thunk } \pi \text{force } w \mid \pi' \mapsto \text{force thunk } \pi' \text{force } w \} \\
& \hspace{15em} (\text{IH projection}) \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \{ \pi \mapsto \pi \text{force } w \mid \pi' \mapsto \pi' \text{force } w \} \hspace{15em} (U\beta) \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk force } w \hspace{15em} (\&\eta) \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq w \hspace{15em} (U\eta)
\end{aligned}$$

(4) \rightarrow :

(a) Retraction

$$z : U(A \rightarrow \underline{\underline{B}}) \vdash$$
$$\llbracket \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } \llbracket \langle U(A' \rightarrow \underline{B'}) \leftarrow U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \rangle \rrbracket [z]]$$
$$\begin{aligned} \models \lambda x : A. (\llbracket \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } \llbracket \langle U(A' \rightarrow \underline{B}') \hookrightarrow U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \rangle \rrbracket [z]]) x \\ (\rightarrow \eta) \end{aligned}$$
$$\begin{aligned} & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \lambda x : A. \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [(\text{force } \llbracket \langle U(A' \rightarrow \underline{B}') \rangle \hookrightarrow U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \rrbracket [z]) (\llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket [x])] \\ & \hspace{15em} (\text{cast reduction}) \end{aligned}$$
$$\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \lambda x : A. \quad (\text{cast reduction})$$
$$\llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{bind } y \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle [x]]; \text{force } \langle \underline{UB}' \leftarrow \underline{UB} \rangle [\text{thunk } (($$
$$\begin{aligned} & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \lambda x : A. \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{bind } y \leftarrow \text{ret } x; \text{force } \langle \underline{U}\underline{B}' \leftarrow \underline{U}\underline{B} \rangle [\text{thunk } ((\text{force } z) y)]] \\ & \quad \text{(IH Retraction)} \end{aligned}$$
$$\exists\sqsubseteq \lambda x : A. \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } \langle \underline{UB}' \leftarrow \underline{UB} \rangle [\text{thunk } ((\text{force } z) x)]] \quad (F\beta)$$
$$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \lambda x : A. \text{force thunk } ((\text{force } z) x) \quad (\text{IH retraction})$$
$$\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \lambda x : A.(\text{force } z) x \quad (U^\beta)$$
$$\exists z \text{ force } z \quad (\rightarrow \eta)$$

(b) Projection

$$w : U(A' \rightarrow \underline{B}') \vdash$$

$$\llbracket \langle U(A' \rightarrow \underline{B}') \hookrightarrow U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } w]]$$

$$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk force } \llbracket \langle U(A' \rightarrow \underline{B}') \hookrightarrow U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } w]] \quad (U\eta)$$

$$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \lambda x' : A'.$$

$$(\text{force } \llbracket \langle U(A' \rightarrow \underline{B}') \hookrightarrow U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } w]]) x' \quad (\rightarrow \eta)$$

$$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \lambda x' : A'.$$

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A \leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } x']; \quad (\text{cast reduction})$$

$$\text{force } \llbracket \langle \underline{U}\underline{B}' \hookrightarrow \underline{U}\underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } ((\text{force thunk } \llbracket \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } w]) x)]$$

$$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \lambda x' : A'.$$

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A \leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } x']; \quad (U\beta)$$

$$\text{force } \llbracket \langle \underline{U}\underline{B}' \hookrightarrow \underline{U}\underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } ((\llbracket \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } w]) x)]$$

$$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \lambda x' : A'.$$

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A \leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } x']; \quad (\text{cast reduction})$$

$$\text{force } \llbracket \langle \underline{U}\underline{B}' \hookrightarrow \underline{U}\underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [(\text{force } w)(\langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle [x])]]$$

$$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \lambda x' : A'.$$

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A \leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } x']; \quad (F\beta)$$

$$\text{bind } x' \leftarrow \text{ret } \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle [x];$$

$$\text{force } \llbracket \langle \underline{U}\underline{B}' \hookrightarrow \underline{U}\underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [(\text{force } w)x']]$$

$$\sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \lambda x' : A'.$$

$$(\text{IH projection})$$

$$\text{bind } x' \leftarrow \text{ret } x';$$

$$\text{force } \llbracket \langle \underline{U}\underline{B}' \hookrightarrow \underline{U}\underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [(\text{force } w)x']]$$

$$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \lambda x' : A'. \text{force } \llbracket \langle \underline{U}\underline{B}' \hookrightarrow \underline{U}\underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [(\text{force } w)x']]$$

$$(F\beta)$$

$$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \lambda x' : A'. \text{force } \llbracket \langle \underline{U}\underline{B}' \hookrightarrow \underline{U}\underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force thunk } ((\text{force } w)x')]]$$

$$(F\beta)$$

$$\sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \lambda x' : A'. \text{force thunk } ((\text{force } w)x')$$

$$(\text{IH projection})$$

$$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } \lambda x' : A'. ((\text{force } w)x')$$

$$(U\beta)$$

$$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{thunk force } w$$

$$(\rightarrow \eta)$$

$$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq w$$

$$(U\eta)$$

(5) \underline{F} :

(a) To show retraction we need to show

$$z : U\underline{F}A \vdash \text{force } z \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A \leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force thunk (bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{ret } \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket)]$$

We calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A \leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force thunk (bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{ret } \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket)] \\ & \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A \leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle \rrbracket [(\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{ret } \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket)] & (U\beta) \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A \leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{ret } \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket] & (\text{comm conv}) \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{ret } x & (\text{IH value retraction}) \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{force } z & (F\eta) \end{aligned}$$

(b) To show projection we need to show

$$w : U\underline{F}A' \vdash \text{thunk (bind } x \leftarrow \text{force thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A \leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } w]; \text{ret } \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket) \sqsubseteq$$

We calculate as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{thunk (bind } x \leftarrow \text{force thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A \leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } w]; \text{ret } \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket) \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{thunk (bind } x \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A \leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{force } w]; \text{ret } \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket) & (U\beta) \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{thunk force } w & (\text{IH value projection}) \\ & \sqsubseteq w & (U\eta) \end{aligned}$$

□

While the above was tedious, this pays off greatly in later proofs: this is the *only* proof in the entire development that needs to inspect the definition of a “shifted” cast (a downcast between \underline{F} types or an upcast between U types). All later lemmas have cases for these shifted casts, but *only* use the property that they are part of an ep pair. This is one of the biggest advantages of using an explicit syntax for complex values and complex stacks: the shifted casts are the only ones that non-trivially use effectful terms, so after this lemma is established we only have to manipulate values and stacks, which compose much more nicely than effectful terms. Conceptually, the main reason we can avoid reasoning about the definitions of the shifted casts directly is that any two shifted casts that form an ep pair with the same value embedding/stack projection are equal:

LEMMA 4.28 (VALUE EMBEDDING DETERMINES PROJECTION, COMPUTATION PROJECTION DETERMINES EMBEDDING). *For any value $x : A \vdash V_e : A'$ and stacks $\bullet : \underline{F}A' \vdash S_1 : \underline{F}A$ and $\bullet : \underline{F}A' \vdash S_2 : \underline{F}A$, if (V_e, S_1) and (V_e, S_2) are both value ep pairs, then*

$$S_1 \sqsubseteq S_2$$

Similarly for any values $x : \underline{UB} \vdash V_1 : \underline{UB}'$ and $x : \underline{UB} \vdash V_2 : \underline{UB}'$ and stack $\bullet : \underline{B}' \vdash S_p : \underline{B}$, if (V_1, S_p) and (V_2, S_p) are both computation ep pairs then

$$V_1 \sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq V_2$$

PROOF. By symmetry it is sufficient to show $S_1 \sqsubseteq S_2$.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{S_1 \sqsubseteq S_1}{\text{bind } x \leftarrow S_1; \text{ret } x \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; S_1[\text{ret } x]}}{\text{bind } x \leftarrow S_1; \text{ret } V_e \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } x}}{\text{bind } x \leftarrow S_1; \text{ret } x \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; S_2[\text{ret } x]}}{\bullet : \underline{FA}' \vdash S_1 \sqsubseteq S_2 : \underline{FA}}$$

similarly to show $V_1 \sqsubseteq V_2$:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{x : \underline{UB} \vdash \text{thunk force } V_2 \sqsubseteq \text{thunk force } V_2 : \underline{UB}'}{x : \underline{UB} \vdash \text{thunk force } x \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } S_p[\text{force } V_2]}}{x : \underline{UB} \vdash \text{thunk force } V_1 \sqsubseteq \text{thunk force } V_2 : \underline{UB}'}}{x : \underline{UB} \vdash V_1 \sqsubseteq V_2 : \underline{UB}'}$$

□

The next two lemmas on the way to axiomatic graduality show that Figure 9 translates $\langle A \hookrightarrow A \rangle$ to the identity and $\langle A'' \hookrightarrow A' \rangle \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle$ to the same contract as $\langle A'' \hookrightarrow A \rangle$, and similarly for downcasts. Intuitively, for all connectives except \underline{F} , \underline{U} , this is because of functoriality of the type constructors on values and stacks. For the \underline{F} , \underline{U} cases, we will use the corresponding fact about the dual cast, i.e., to prove the \underline{FA} to \underline{FA} downcast is the identity stack, we know by inductive hypothesis that the A to A upcast is the identity, and that the identity stack is a projection for the identity. Therefore Lemma 4.28 implies that the \underline{FA} downcast must be equivalent to the identity. We now discuss these two lemmas and their proofs in detail.

First, we show that the casts from a type to itself are equivalent to the identity. Below, we will use this lemma to prove the reflexivity case of the axiomatic graduality theorem, and to prove a conservativity result, which says that a GTT homogeneous term dynamism is the same as a CBPV* inequality between their translations.

LEMMA 4.29 (IDENTITY EXPANSION). *For any A and B ,*

$$x : A \vdash \llbracket \langle A \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket \sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq x : A \qquad \bullet : \underline{B} \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \hookleftarrow \underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket \sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B}$$

PROOF. We proceed by induction on A , B , following the proof that reflexivity is admissible given in Lemma 4.20.

- (1) If $A \in \{1, ?\}$, then $\llbracket \langle A \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket[x] = x$.
- (2) If $A = 0$, then absurd $x \sqsubseteq x$ by 0η .
- (3) If $A = UB$, then by inductive hypothesis $\llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \bullet$. By Lemma 4.26, $(x.x, \bullet)$ is a computation ep pair from \underline{B} to itself. But by Lemma 4.27, $(\llbracket \langle U\underline{B} \hookrightarrow U\underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket[x], \bullet)$ is also a computation ep pair so the result follows by uniqueness of embeddings from computation projections Lemma 4.28.
- (4) If $A = A_1 \times A_2$ or $A = A_1 + A_2$, the result follows by the η principle and inductive hypothesis.
- (5) If $\underline{B} = \underline{i}$, $\llbracket \langle \underline{i} \leftarrow \underline{i} \rangle \rrbracket = \bullet$.
- (6) For $\underline{B} = \top$, the result follows by $\top\eta$.
- (7) For $\underline{B} = \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2$ or $\underline{B} = A \rightarrow \underline{B}'$, the result follows by inductive hypothesis and η .
- (8) For $\underline{B} = \underline{F}A$, by inductive hypothesis, the downcast is a projection for the value embedding $x.x$, so the result follows by identity ep pair and uniqueness of projections from value embeddings.

□

Second, we show that a composition of upcasts is translated to the same thing as a direct upcast, and similarly for downcasts. Below, we will use this lemma to translate *transitivity* of term dynamism in GTT.

LEMMA 4.30 (CAST DECOMPOSITION). *For any dynamic type interpretation ρ ,*

$$\frac{A \sqsubseteq A' \sqsubseteq A''}{x : A \vdash \llbracket \langle A'' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket_\rho \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle A'' \hookrightarrow A' \rangle \rrbracket_\rho [\llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket_\rho] : A''}$$

$$\frac{\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}' \sqsubseteq \underline{B}''}{\bullet : \underline{B}'' \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}'' \rangle \rrbracket_\rho \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket_\rho [\llbracket \langle \underline{B}' \leftarrow \underline{B}'' \rangle \rrbracket_\rho]}$$

PROOF. By mutual induction on A, \underline{B} .

- (1) $A \sqsubseteq A' \sqsubseteq A''$
 - (a) If $A = 0$, we need to show $x : 0 \vdash \llbracket \langle A'' \hookrightarrow 0 \rangle \rrbracket[x] \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle A'' \hookrightarrow A' \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow 0 \rangle \rrbracket[x]] : A''$ which follows by 0η .
 - (b) If $A = ?$, then $A' = A'' = ?$, and both casts are the identity.
 - (c) If $A \notin \{?, 0\}$ and $A' = ?$, then $A'' = ?$ and $\llbracket \langle ? \hookrightarrow ? \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle ? \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket] = \llbracket \langle ? \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket$ by definition.
 - (d) If $A, A' \notin \{?, 0\}$ and $A'' = ?$, then $\lfloor A \rfloor = \lfloor A' \rfloor$, which we call G and

$$\llbracket \langle ? \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket = \llbracket \langle ? \hookrightarrow G \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle G \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket]$$

and

$$\llbracket \langle ? \hookrightarrow A' \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket] = \llbracket \langle ? \hookrightarrow G \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle G \hookrightarrow A' \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket]]$$

so this reduces to the case for $A \sqsubseteq A' \sqsubseteq G$, below.

(e) If $A, A', A'' \notin \{?, 0\}$, then they all have the same top-level constructor:

(i) $+$: We need to show for $A_1 \sqsubseteq A'_1 \sqsubseteq A''_1$ and $A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_2 \sqsubseteq A''_2$:

$$x : \llbracket A_1 \rrbracket + \llbracket A_2 \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle A''_1 + A''_2 \sqsubset A'_1 + A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \sqsubset A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x] \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle A''_1 + A''_2 \sqsubset A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x]$$

We proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket \langle A''_1 + A''_2 \sqsubset A'_1 + A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \sqsubset A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x] \rrbracket \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{case } x \quad (+\eta) \\ & \quad \{x_1. \llbracket \langle A''_1 + A''_2 \sqsubset A'_1 + A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \sqsubset A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{inl } x_1] \rrbracket \\ & \quad \mid x_2. \llbracket \langle A''_1 + A''_2 \sqsubset A'_1 + A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \sqsubset A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{inr } x_2] \rrbracket \} \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{case } x \quad (\text{cast reduction}) \\ & \quad \{x_1. \llbracket \langle A''_1 + A''_2 \sqsubset A'_1 + A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{inl } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \sqsubset A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [x_1] \rrbracket \\ & \quad \mid x_2. \llbracket \langle A''_1 + A''_2 \sqsubset A'_1 + A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [\text{inr } \llbracket \langle A'_2 \sqsubset A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x_2] \rrbracket \} \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{case } x \quad (\text{cast reduction}) \\ & \quad \{x_1. \text{inl } \llbracket \langle A''_1 \sqsubset A'_1 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \langle A'_1 \sqsubset A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [x_1] \rrbracket \\ & \quad \mid x_2. \text{inr } \llbracket \langle A''_2 \sqsubset A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \langle A'_2 \sqsubset A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x_2] \rrbracket \} \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{case } x \quad (\text{IH}) \\ & \quad \{x_1. \text{inl } \llbracket \langle A''_1 \sqsubset A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [x_1] \rrbracket \\ & \quad \mid x_2. \text{inr } \llbracket \langle A''_2 \sqsubset A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x_2] \rrbracket \} \\ & = \llbracket \langle A''_1 + A''_2 \sqsubset A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x] \quad (\text{definition}) \end{aligned}$$

(ii) 1: By definition both sides are the identity.

(iii) \times : We need to show for $A_1 \sqsubseteq A'_1 \sqsubseteq A''_1$ and $A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_2 \sqsubseteq A''_2$:

$$x : \llbracket A_1 \rrbracket \times \llbracket A_2 \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle A''_1 \times A''_2 \sqsubset A'_1 \times A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \langle A'_1 \times A'_2 \sqsubset A_1 \times A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x] \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle A''_1 \times A''_2 \sqsubset A_1 \times A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x]$$

We proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket \langle A''_1 \times A''_2 \sqsubset A'_1 \times A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \langle A'_1 \times A'_2 \sqsubset A_1 \times A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x] \rrbracket \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{split } x \text{ to } (y, z). \llbracket \langle A''_1 \times A''_2 \sqsubset A'_1 \times A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \langle A'_1 \times A'_2 \sqsubset A_1 \times A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [(y, z)] \rrbracket \quad (\times\eta) \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{split } x \text{ to } (y, z). \llbracket \langle A''_1 \times A''_2 \sqsubset A'_1 \times A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket (\llbracket \langle A'_1 \sqsubset A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [y], \llbracket \langle A'_2 \sqsubset A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [z]) \rrbracket \rrbracket \quad (\text{cast reduction}) \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{split } x \text{ to } (y, z). (\llbracket \langle A''_1 \sqsubset A'_1 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \langle A'_1 \sqsubset A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [y] \rrbracket, \llbracket \langle A''_2 \sqsubset A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \langle A'_2 \sqsubset A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [z] \rrbracket \rrbracket \quad (\text{cast reduction}) \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{split } x \text{ to } (y, z). (\llbracket \langle A''_1 \sqsubset A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [y], \llbracket \langle A''_2 \sqsubset A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [z]) \rrbracket \quad (\text{IH}) \\ & = \llbracket \langle A''_1 \times A''_2 \sqsubset A_1 \times A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [x] \quad (\text{definition}) \end{aligned}$$

(iv) $\underline{UB} \sqsubseteq \underline{UB'} \sqsubseteq \underline{UB''}$. We need to show

$$x : \underline{UB} \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{UB''} \leftarrow \underline{UB'} \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle \underline{UB'} \leftarrow \underline{UB} \rangle \rrbracket [x]] \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{UB''} \leftarrow \underline{UB} \rangle \rrbracket [x] : \underline{UB''}$$

By composition of ep pairs, we know $(x.\llbracket \langle \underline{UB''} \leftarrow \underline{UB'} \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle \underline{UB'} \leftarrow \underline{UB} \rangle \rrbracket [x]], \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle \underline{B'} \leftarrow \underline{B''} \rangle \rrbracket])$ is a computation ep pair. Furthermore, by inductive hypothesis, we know

$$\llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle \underline{B'} \leftarrow \underline{B''} \rangle \rrbracket] \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B''} \rangle \rrbracket$$

so then both sides form ep pairs paired with $\llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B''} \rangle \rrbracket$, so it follows because computation projections determine embeddings 4.28.

(2) $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''}$

(a) If $\underline{B} = \top$, then the result is immediate by $\eta\top$.

(b) If $\underline{B} = \underline{\iota}$, then $\underline{B'} = \underline{B''} = \underline{\iota}$ then both sides are just \bullet .

(c) If $\underline{B} \notin \{\underline{\iota}, \top\}$, and $\underline{B'} = \underline{\iota}$, then $\underline{B''} = \underline{\iota}$

$$\llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{\iota} \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle \underline{\iota} \leftarrow \underline{\iota} \rangle \rrbracket] = \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{\iota} \rangle \rrbracket$$

(d) If $\underline{B}, \underline{B'} \notin \{\underline{\iota}, \top\}$, and $\underline{B''} = \underline{\iota}$, and $\lfloor \underline{B} \rfloor = \lfloor \underline{B'} \rfloor$, which we call \underline{G} . Then we need to show

$$\llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle \underline{B'} \leftarrow \underline{G} \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle \underline{G} \leftarrow \underline{\iota} \rangle \rrbracket]] \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{G} \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle \underline{G} \leftarrow \underline{\iota} \rangle \rrbracket]$$

so the result follows from the case $\underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'} \sqsubseteq \underline{G}$, which is handled below.

(e) If $\underline{B}, \underline{B'}, \underline{B''} \notin \{\underline{\iota}, \top\}$, then they all have the same top-level constructor:

(i) & We are given $\underline{B}_1 \sqsubseteq \underline{B'_1} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''_1}$ and $\underline{B}_2 \sqsubseteq \underline{B'_2} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''_2}$ and we need to show

$$\bullet : \underline{B''_1} \& \underline{B''_2} \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B'_1} \& \underline{B'_2} \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle \underline{B'_1} \& \underline{B'_2} \leftarrow \underline{B''_1} \& \underline{B''_2} \rangle \rrbracket] : \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2$$

We proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B'_1} \& \underline{B'_2} \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle \underline{B'_1} \& \underline{B'_2} \leftarrow \underline{B''_1} \& \underline{B''_2} \rangle \rrbracket] \\ & \sqsubseteq \{ \pi \mapsto \pi \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B'_1} \& \underline{B'_2} \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle \underline{B'_1} \& \underline{B'_2} \leftarrow \underline{B''_1} \& \underline{B''_2} \rangle \rrbracket] \} \quad (\&\eta) \\ & \quad | \pi' \mapsto \pi' \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B'_1} \& \underline{B'_2} \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle \underline{B'_1} \& \underline{B'_2} \leftarrow \underline{B''_1} \& \underline{B''_2} \rangle \rrbracket] \} \\ & \sqsubseteq \{ \pi \mapsto \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \leftarrow \underline{B'_1} \rangle \rrbracket [\pi \llbracket \langle \underline{B'_1} \& \underline{B'_2} \leftarrow \underline{B''_1} \& \underline{B''_2} \rangle \rrbracket] \} \quad (\text{cast reduction}) \\ & \quad | \pi' \mapsto \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B'_2} \rangle \rrbracket [\pi' \llbracket \langle \underline{B'_1} \& \underline{B'_2} \leftarrow \underline{B''_1} \& \underline{B''_2} \rangle \rrbracket] \} \\ & \sqsubseteq \{ \pi \mapsto \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \leftarrow \underline{B'_1} \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle \underline{B'_1} \leftarrow \underline{B''_1} \rangle \rrbracket [\pi \bullet]] \} \quad (\text{cast reduction}) \\ & \quad | \pi' \mapsto \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B'_2} \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle \underline{B'_2} \leftarrow \underline{B''_2} \rangle \rrbracket [\pi' \bullet]] \} \\ & \sqsubseteq \{ \pi \mapsto \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \leftarrow \underline{B''_1} \rangle \rrbracket [\pi \bullet] \mid \pi' \mapsto \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B''_2} \rangle \rrbracket [\pi' \bullet] \} \quad (\text{IH}) \\ & = \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B''_1} \& \underline{B''_2} \rangle \rrbracket \quad (\text{definition}) \end{aligned}$$

(ii) \rightarrow , assume we are given $A \sqsubseteq A' \sqsubseteq A''$ and $B \sqsubseteq B' \sqsubseteq B''$, then we proceed:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \llbracket \langle A \rightarrow B \leftarrow A' \rightarrow B' \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle A' \rightarrow B' \leftarrow A'' \rightarrow B'' \rangle \rrbracket] \\
& \sqsubseteq \lambda x : A. (\llbracket \langle A \rightarrow B \leftarrow A' \rightarrow B' \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle A' \rightarrow B' \leftarrow A'' \rightarrow B'' \rangle \rrbracket [\bullet]] x) \quad (\rightarrow \eta) \\
& \sqsubseteq \lambda x : A. \llbracket \langle B \leftarrow B' \rangle \rrbracket (\llbracket \langle A' \rightarrow B' \leftarrow A'' \rightarrow B'' \rangle \rrbracket [\bullet]) \llbracket \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle \rrbracket [x] \\
& \hspace{15em} (\text{cast reduction}) \\
& \sqsubseteq \lambda x : A. \llbracket \langle B \leftarrow B' \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle B' \leftarrow B'' \rangle \rrbracket [\bullet \llbracket \langle A'' \leftarrow A' \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle \rrbracket [x]]]] \\
& \hspace{15em} (\text{cast reduction}) \\
& \sqsubseteq \lambda x : A. \llbracket \langle B \leftarrow B'' \rangle \rrbracket [\bullet \llbracket \langle A'' \leftarrow A \rangle \rrbracket [x]] \\
& = \llbracket \langle A \rightarrow B \leftarrow A \rightarrow B' \rangle \rrbracket [\bullet] \hspace{10em} (\text{definition})
\end{aligned}$$

(iii) $\underline{F}A \sqsubseteq \underline{F}A' \sqsubseteq \underline{F}A''$. First, by composition of ep pairs, we know

$$(x. \llbracket \langle A'' \leftarrow A' \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle \rrbracket [x]], \llbracket \langle \underline{F}A \leftarrow \underline{F}A' \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle \underline{F}A' \leftarrow \underline{F}A'' \rangle \rrbracket])$$

form a value ep pair. Furthermore, by inductive hypothesis, we know

$$x : A \vdash \llbracket \langle A'' \leftarrow A' \rangle \rrbracket [\llbracket \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle \rrbracket [x]] \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle A'' \leftarrow A \rangle \rrbracket [x]$$

so the two sides of our equation are both projections with the same value embedding, so the equation follows from uniqueness of projections from value embeddings.

□

The final lemma before the graduality theorem lets us “move a cast” from left to right or vice-versa, via the adjunction property for ep pairs. These arise in the proof cases for `return` and `thunk`, because in those cases the inductive hypothesis is in terms of an upcast (downcast) and the conclusion is in terms of a downcast (upcast).

LEMMA 4.31 (HOM-SET FORMULATION OF ADJUNCTION). *For any value embedding-projection pair V_e, S_p from A to A' , the following are equivalent:*

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \text{ret } V_e[V] \sqsubseteq M : \underline{F}A'}{\Gamma \vdash \text{ret } V \sqsubseteq S_p[M] : \underline{F}A}$$

For any computation ep pair (V_e, S_p) from B to B' , the following are equivalent:

$$\frac{\Gamma, z' : UB' \vdash M \sqsubseteq S[S_p[\text{force } z']]}{\Gamma, z : UB \vdash M[V_e/z'] \sqsubseteq S[\text{force } z]} : C$$

PROOF. (1) Assume $\text{ret } V_e[V] \sqsubseteq M : \underline{F}A'$. Then by retraction, $\text{ret } V \sqsubseteq S_p[\text{ret } V_e[V]]$ so by transitivity, the result follows by substitution:

$$\frac{S_p \sqsubseteq S_p \quad \text{ret } V_e[V] \sqsubseteq M}{S_p[\text{ret } V_e[V]] \sqsubseteq M}$$

- (2) Assume $\text{ret } V \sqsubseteq S_p[M] : \underline{F}A$. Then by projection, $\text{bind } x \leftarrow S_p[M]; \text{ret } V_e[x] \sqsubseteq M$, so it is sufficient to show

$$\text{ret } V_e[V] \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow S_p[M]; \text{ret } V_e[x]$$

but again by substitution we have

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } V; \text{ret } V_e[x] \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow S_p[M]; \text{ret } V_e[x]$$

and by $\underline{F}\beta$, the LHS is equivalent to $\text{ret } V_e[V]$.

- (3) Assume $z' : \underline{U}B' \vdash M \sqsubseteq S[S_p[\text{force } z']]$, then by projection, $S[S_p[\text{force } V_e]] \sqsubseteq S[\text{force } z]$ and by substitution:

$$\frac{M \sqsubseteq S[S_p[\text{force } z']] \quad V_e \sqsubseteq V_e \quad S[S_p[\text{force } V_e]] = (S[S_p[\text{force } z']])[V_e/z']}{M[V_e/z'] \sqsubseteq S[S_p[\text{force } V_e]]}$$

- (4) Assume $z : \underline{U}B \vdash M[V_e/z'] \sqsubseteq S[\text{force } z]$. Then by retraction, $M \sqsubseteq M[V_e[\text{thunk } S_p[\text{force } z]]]$ and by substitution:

$$M[V_e[\text{thunk } S_p[\text{force } z]]] \sqsubseteq S[\text{force } \text{thunk } S_p[\text{force } z]]$$

and the right is equivalent to $S[S_p[\text{force } z]]$ by $\underline{U}\beta$.

□

Finally, we prove the axiomatic graduality theorem. In addition to the lemmas above, the main task is to prove the “compatibility” cases which are the congruence cases for introduction and elimination rules. These come down to proving that the casts “commute” with introduction/elimination forms, and are all simple calculations.

THEOREM (AXIOMATIC GRADUALITY). *For any dynamic type interpretation, the following are true:*

$$\frac{\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma' \quad \Psi : \Delta \sqsubseteq \Delta' \quad \Phi \mid \Psi \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'}{[\Gamma] \mid [\Delta'] \vdash [M][[\Psi]] \sqsubseteq [\langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle][[M']][[\Phi]] : [\underline{B}]}$$

$$\frac{\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma' \quad \Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A \sqsubseteq A'}{[\Gamma] \vdash [\langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle][[V]] \sqsubseteq [V'][[\Phi]] : [A']}$$

PROOF. By mutual induction over term dynamism derivations. For the β, η and reflexivity rules, we use the identity expansion lemma and the corresponding β, η rule of CBPV*[4.29](#).

For compatibility rules a pattern emerges. Universal rules (positive intro, negative elim) are easy, we don’t need to reason about casts at all. For “(co)-pattern matching rules” (positive elim, negative intro), we need to invoke the η principle (or commuting conversion, which is derived from the η principle). In all compatibility cases, the cast reduction lemma keeps the proof straightforward.

Fortunately, all reasoning about “shifted” casts is handled in lemmas, and here we only deal with the “nice” value upcasts/stack downcasts.

(1) Transitivity for values: The GTT rule is

$$\frac{\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma' \quad \Phi' : \Gamma' \sqsubseteq \Gamma'' \quad \Phi'' : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma'' \quad \Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A \sqsubseteq A' \quad \Phi' \vdash V' \sqsubseteq V'' : A' \sqsubseteq A''}{\Phi'' \vdash V \sqsubseteq V'' : A \sqsubseteq A''}$$

Which under translation (and the same assumptions about the contexts) is

$$\frac{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket V \rrbracket \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \llbracket V' \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket : \llbracket A' \rrbracket \quad \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket V' \rrbracket \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \llbracket V'' \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Phi' \rrbracket \rrbracket : \llbracket A'' \rrbracket}{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle A'' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket V \rrbracket \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \llbracket V'' \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Phi'' \rrbracket \rrbracket : \llbracket A'' \rrbracket}$$

We proceed as follows, the key lemma here is the cast decomposition lemma:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \langle A'' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket V \rrbracket \rrbracket &\sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle A'' \hookrightarrow A' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket V \rrbracket \rrbracket \rrbracket \quad (\text{cast decomposition}) \\ &\sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle A'' \hookrightarrow A' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket V' \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket \rrbracket \quad (\text{IH}) \\ &\sqsubseteq \llbracket \llbracket V'' \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Phi' \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket \rrbracket \quad (\text{IH}) \\ &\sqsubseteq \llbracket \llbracket V'' \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Phi'' \rrbracket \rrbracket \rrbracket \quad (\text{cast decomposition}) \end{aligned}$$

(2) Transitivity for terms: The GTT rule is

$$\frac{\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma' \quad \Phi' : \Gamma' \sqsubseteq \Gamma'' \quad \Phi'' : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma'' \quad \Psi : \Delta \sqsubseteq \Delta' \quad \Psi : \Delta' \sqsubseteq \Delta'' \quad \Psi'' : \Delta \sqsubseteq \Delta'' \quad \Phi \mid \Psi \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'} \quad \Phi' \mid \Psi' \vdash M' \sqsubseteq M'' : \underline{B'} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''}}{\Phi'' \mid \Psi'' \vdash M \sqsubseteq M'' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B''}}$$

Which under translation (and the same assumptions about the contexts) is

$$\frac{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \mid \llbracket \Delta' \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket M \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \hookleftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket M' \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket \rrbracket : \llbracket \underline{B} \rrbracket \quad \llbracket \Gamma' \rrbracket \mid \llbracket \Delta'' \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B'} \hookleftarrow \underline{B''} \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket M'' \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Phi' \rrbracket \rrbracket \rrbracket : \llbracket \underline{B'} \rrbracket}{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \mid \llbracket \Delta'' \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket M \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Psi'' \rrbracket \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \hookleftarrow \underline{B''} \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket M'' \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Phi'' \rrbracket \rrbracket \rrbracket : \llbracket \underline{B} \rrbracket}$$

We proceed as follows, the key lemma here is the cast decomposition lemma:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Psi'' \rrbracket \rrbracket &\sqsubseteq \llbracket M \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket \rrbracket \rrbracket \quad (\text{Cast decomposition}) \\ &\sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \hookleftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket M' \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Psi' \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket \rrbracket \rrbracket \quad (\text{IH}) \\ &\sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \hookleftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \langle \underline{B'} \hookleftarrow \underline{B''} \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket M'' \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Phi' \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket \rrbracket \rrbracket \quad (\text{IH}) \\ &\sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \hookleftarrow \underline{B''} \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket M'' \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket \Phi'' \rrbracket \rrbracket \rrbracket \quad (\text{Cast decomposition}) \end{aligned}$$

(3) Substitution of a value in a value: The GTT rule is

$$\frac{\Phi, x \sqsubseteq x' : A_1 \sqsubseteq A'_1 \vdash V_2 \sqsubseteq V'_2 : A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_2 \quad \Phi \vdash V_1 \sqsubseteq V'_1 : A_1 \sqsubseteq A'_1}{\Phi \vdash V_2[V_1/x] \sqsubseteq V'_2[V'_1/x'] : A_2 \sqsubseteq A'_2}$$

Where $\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma'$. Under translation, we need to show

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, x : \llbracket A_1 \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket V_2 \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket V'_2 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [x]/x' : \llbracket A'_2 \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket V_1 \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket V'_1 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket : \llbracket A'_1 \rrbracket \end{array}}{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket V_2[V_1/x] \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket V'_2[V'_1/x'] \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket : \llbracket A'_2 \rrbracket}$$

Which follows by compositionality:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket V_2[V_1/x] \rrbracket &= (\llbracket \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket V_2 \rrbracket) \llbracket V_1 \rrbracket / x \quad (\text{Compositionality}) \\ &\sqsubseteq \llbracket V'_2 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [x]/x' \llbracket V_1 \rrbracket / x \quad (\text{IH}) \\ &= \llbracket V'_2 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket V_1 \rrbracket / x' \\ &\sqsubseteq \llbracket V'_2 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \llbracket V'_1 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket / x' \quad (\text{IH}) \\ &= \llbracket V'_2[V'_1/x'] \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

(4) Substitution of a value in a term: The GTT rule is

$$\frac{\Phi, x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A' \mid \Psi \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'} \quad \Phi \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A \sqsubseteq A'}{\Phi \vdash M[V/x] \sqsubseteq M'[V'/x'] : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}}$$

Where $\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma'$ and $\Psi : \Delta \sqsubseteq \Delta'$. Under translation this is:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, x : \llbracket A \rrbracket \mid \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket M \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket [x]/x' : \llbracket \underline{B} \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket V \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket V' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket : \llbracket A' \rrbracket \end{array}}{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \mid \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket M[V/x] \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket M'[V'/x'] \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket : \llbracket \underline{B} \rrbracket}$$

Which follows from compositionality of the translation:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket M[V/x] \rrbracket &= \llbracket M \rrbracket \llbracket V \rrbracket / x \quad (\text{Compositionality}) \\ &\sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket [x]/x' \llbracket V \rrbracket / x \quad (\text{IH}) \\ &= \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket V \rrbracket / x' \\ &\sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \llbracket V' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket / x' \quad (\text{IH}) \\ &= \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket M'[V'/x'] \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \quad (\text{Compositionality}) \end{aligned}$$

(5) Substitution of a term in a stack: The GTT rule is

$$\frac{\Phi \mid \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'} \vdash S \sqsubseteq S' : \underline{C} \sqsubseteq \underline{C'} \quad \Phi \mid \cdot \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}}{\Phi \mid \cdot \vdash S[M] \sqsubseteq S'[M'] : \underline{C} \sqsubseteq \underline{C'}}$$

Where $\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma'$. Under translation this is

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \mid \bullet : \llbracket \underline{B'} \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket S \rrbracket \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket [\bullet] \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{C} \leftarrow \underline{C'} \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket S' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket : \llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \mid \cdot \vdash \llbracket M \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket : \llbracket \underline{B} \rrbracket \end{array}}{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \mid \cdot \vdash \llbracket S[M] \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{C} \leftarrow \underline{C'} \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket S'[M'] \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket : \llbracket \underline{C} \rrbracket}$$

We follows easily using compositionality of the translation:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \llbracket S[M] \rrbracket &= \llbracket S \rrbracket[\llbracket M \rrbracket] && \text{(Compositionality)} \\
 &\sqsubseteq \llbracket S \rrbracket[\llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket M' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]]] && \text{(IH)} \\
 &\sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{C} \leftarrow \underline{C}' \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket S' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket][\llbracket M' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]]] && \text{(IH)} \\
 &= \llbracket \langle \underline{C} \leftarrow \underline{C}' \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket S'[M'] \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]] && \text{(Compositionality)}
 \end{aligned}$$

(6) Variables: The GTT rule is

$$\Gamma_1 \sqsubseteq \Gamma'_1, x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A', \Gamma_2 \sqsubseteq \Gamma'_2 \vdash x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A'$$

which under translation is

$$\llbracket \Gamma_1 \rrbracket, x : \llbracket A \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma_2 \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle \rrbracket[x] \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle \rrbracket[x] : \llbracket A' \rrbracket$$

which is an instance of reflexivity.

(7) Hole: The GTT rule is

$$\Phi \mid \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}' \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B}'$$

which under translation is

$$\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \mid \bullet : \underline{B}' \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket[\bullet] \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket[\bullet] : \underline{B}$$

which is an instance of reflexivity.

(8) Error is bottom: The GTT axiom is

$$\Phi \vdash \mathcal{U} \sqsubseteq M : \underline{B}$$

where $\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma'$, so we need to show

$$\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \vdash \mathcal{U} \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket M \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]] : \llbracket \underline{B} \rrbracket$$

which is an instance of the error is bottom axiom of CBPV.

(9) Error strictness: The GTT axiom is

$$\Phi \vdash S[\mathcal{U}] \sqsubseteq \mathcal{U} : \underline{B}$$

where $\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma'$, which under translation is

$$\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket S \rrbracket[\mathcal{U}] \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket[\mathcal{U}] : \llbracket \underline{B} \rrbracket$$

By strictness of stacks in CBPV, both sides are equivalent to \mathcal{U} , so it follows by reflexivity.

(10) UpCast-L: The GTT axiom is

$$x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A' \vdash \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle x \sqsubseteq x' : A'$$

which under translation is

$$x : \llbracket A \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle A' \leftarrow A' \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle \rrbracket[x]] \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle A' \leftarrow A \rangle \rrbracket[x] : A'$$

Which follows by identity expansion and reflexivity.

(11) UpCast-R: The GTT axiom is

$$x : A \vdash x \sqsubseteq \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle x : A \sqsubseteq A'$$

which under translation is

$$x : \llbracket A \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket[x] \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket \langle A \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket[x]] : \llbracket A' \rrbracket$$

which follows by identity expansion and reflexivity.

(12) DnCast-R: The GTT axiom is

$$\bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'} \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle : \underline{B}$$

Which under translation is

$$\bullet : \llbracket \underline{B'} \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket[\bullet] \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B} \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket[\bullet]] : \llbracket \underline{B} \rrbracket$$

Which follows by identity expansion and reflexivity.

(13) DnCast-L: The GTT axiom is

$$\bullet : \underline{B'} \vdash \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B} \sqsubseteq \underline{B'}$$

So under translation we need to show

$$\bullet : \llbracket \underline{B'} \rrbracket \vdash \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket \langle \underline{B'} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket[\bullet]] \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket[\bullet] : \llbracket \underline{B} \rrbracket$$

Which follows immediately by reflexivity and the lemma that identity casts are identities.

(14) 0 elim, we do the term case, the value case is similar

$$\frac{\langle 0 \hookrightarrow 0 \rangle[\llbracket V \rrbracket] \sqsubseteq \llbracket V' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]}{\text{absurd } \llbracket V \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \text{absurd } \llbracket V' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]}$$

Immediate by 0η .

(15) + intro, we do the inl case, the inr case is the same:

$$\frac{\llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket V \rrbracket] \sqsubseteq \llbracket V' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]}{\llbracket \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rrbracket[\text{inl } \llbracket V \rrbracket] \sqsubseteq \text{inl } \llbracket V' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]}$$

Which follows easily:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rrbracket[\text{inl } \llbracket V \rrbracket] &\sqsupseteq \text{inl } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket V \rrbracket] \quad (\text{cast reduction}) \\ &\sqsubseteq \text{inl } \llbracket V' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket] \quad (\text{IH}) \end{aligned}$$

(16) + elim, we do just the cases where the continuations are terms:

$$\begin{aligned} &\llbracket \langle A'_1 + A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_1 + A_2 \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket V \rrbracket] \sqsubseteq \llbracket V' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket] \\ &\llbracket M_1 \rrbracket[\llbracket \Psi \rrbracket] \sqsubseteq \llbracket M'_1 \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket][\llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket[x_1]/x'_1] \\ &\llbracket M_2 \rrbracket[\llbracket \Psi \rrbracket] \sqsubseteq \llbracket M'_2 \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket][\llbracket \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle \rrbracket[x_2]/x'_2] \\ \hline \text{case } \llbracket V \rrbracket\{x_1.\llbracket M_1 \rrbracket[\llbracket \Psi \rrbracket] \mid x_2.\llbracket M_2 \rrbracket[\llbracket \Psi \rrbracket]\} &\sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B'} \rangle \rrbracket[\text{case } \llbracket V \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]\{x'_1.\llbracket M'_1 \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket] \mid \} \end{aligned}$$

(20) \times elim: We show the case where the continuations are terms, the value continuations are no different:

$$\frac{\llbracket \langle A'_1 \times A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_1 \times A_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket [V] \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket [V'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket}{\llbracket [M] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Psi] \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket [M'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket \llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [x]/x' \llbracket \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [y]/y' \rrbracket}$$

$$\text{split } \llbracket [V] \rrbracket \text{ to } (x, y). \llbracket [M] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Psi] \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{split } \llbracket [V'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket \text{ to } (x', y'). \llbracket [M'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket]$$

We proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{split } \llbracket [V] \rrbracket \text{ to } (x, y). \llbracket [M] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Psi] \rrbracket \\ & \subseteq \text{split } \llbracket [V] \rrbracket \text{ to } (x, y). \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket [M'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket \llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [x]/x' \llbracket \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [y]/y' \rrbracket & (\text{IH}) \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{split } \llbracket [V] \rrbracket \text{ to } (x, y). & (\times\beta) \\ & \quad \text{split } (\llbracket \langle A'_1 \hookrightarrow A_1 \rangle \rrbracket [x], \llbracket \langle A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_2 \rangle \rrbracket [y]) \text{ to } (x', y'). \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket [M'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{split } \llbracket [V] \rrbracket \text{ to } (x, y). & (\text{cast reduction}) \\ & \quad \text{split } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \times A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_1 \times A'_2 \rangle \rrbracket [(x, y)] \text{ to } (x', y'). \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket [M'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{split } \llbracket \langle A'_1 \times A'_2 \hookrightarrow A_1 \times A_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket [V] \rrbracket \text{ to } (x', y'). \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket [M'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket & (\times\eta) \\ & \subseteq \text{split } \llbracket [V'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket \text{ to } (x', y'). \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket [M'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket & (\text{IH}) \\ & \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket [\text{split } \llbracket [V'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket \text{ to } (x', y'). \llbracket [M'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket] & (\text{commuting conversion}) \end{aligned}$$

(21) U intro:

$$\frac{\llbracket [M] \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket [M'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket}{\llbracket \langle \underline{UB}' \hookrightarrow \underline{UB} \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket [M] \rrbracket] \subseteq \text{thunk } \llbracket [M'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket}$$

We proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \langle \underline{UB}' \hookrightarrow \underline{UB} \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket [M] \rrbracket] & \subseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{UB}' \hookrightarrow \underline{UB} \rangle \rrbracket [\text{thunk } \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket [M'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket] & (\text{IH}) \\ & \subseteq \text{thunk } \llbracket [M'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket & (\text{alt projection}) \end{aligned}$$

(22) U elim:

$$\frac{\llbracket \langle \underline{UB}' \hookrightarrow \underline{UB} \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket [V] \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket [V'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket}{\text{force } \llbracket [V] \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \text{force } \llbracket [V'] \rrbracket \llbracket [\Phi] \rrbracket}$$

By hom-set formulation of adjunction 4.31.

(23) \top intro:

$$\{\} \subseteq \llbracket \langle \top \leftarrow \top \rangle \rrbracket [\{\}]$$

Immediate by $\top\eta$

(24) & intro:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket M'_1 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket \\ \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket M'_2 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket \end{array}}{\{\pi \mapsto \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \mid \pi' \mapsto \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket\} \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \{\pi \mapsto \llbracket M'_1 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \mid \pi' \mapsto \llbracket M'_2 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket\} \rrbracket}$$

We proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\pi \mapsto \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \mid \pi' \mapsto \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket\} \\ & \sqsubseteq \{\pi \mapsto \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket M'_1 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket \mid \pi' \mapsto \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket M'_2 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket\} \quad (\text{IH}) \\ & \sqsubseteq \{\pi \mapsto \pi \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \{\pi \mapsto \llbracket M'_1 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \mid \pi' \mapsto \llbracket M'_2 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket\} \rrbracket\} \\ & \quad \quad \quad (\text{cast reduction}) \\ & \quad \mid \pi' \mapsto \pi' \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \{\pi \mapsto \llbracket M'_1 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \mid \pi' \mapsto \llbracket M'_2 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket\} \rrbracket\} \\ & \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \{\pi \mapsto \llbracket M'_1 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \mid \pi' \mapsto \llbracket M'_2 \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket\} \rrbracket \quad (\&\eta) \end{aligned}$$

(25) & elim, we show the π case, π' is symmetric:

$$\frac{\llbracket M \rrbracket \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket}{\pi \llbracket M \rrbracket \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \pi \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket}$$

We proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi \llbracket M \rrbracket \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket & \sqsubseteq \pi \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \& \underline{B}'_2 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket \quad (\text{IH}) \\ & \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B}_1 \leftarrow \underline{B}'_1 \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \pi \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket \quad (\text{cast reduction}) \end{aligned}$$

(26)

$$\frac{\llbracket M \rrbracket \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \langle A' \prec A \rangle \rrbracket x/x'}{\lambda x : A. \llbracket M \rrbracket \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \lambda x' : A'. \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket}$$

We proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda x : A. \llbracket M \rrbracket \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \\ & \sqsubseteq \lambda x : A. \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \langle A' \prec A \rangle \rrbracket x/x' \quad (\text{IH}) \\ & \sqsubseteq \lambda x : A. (\llbracket \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \lambda x'. \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket) x \quad (\text{cast reduction}) \\ & \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \lambda x'. \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket \quad (\rightarrow \eta) \end{aligned}$$

(27) We need to show

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \llbracket M \rrbracket \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \langle A' \prec A \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket V \rrbracket \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \llbracket V' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket \end{array}}{\llbracket M \rrbracket \llbracket \Psi \rrbracket \llbracket V \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket M' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket \llbracket \llbracket V' \rrbracket \llbracket \Phi \rrbracket \rrbracket}$$

We proceed:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \llbracket M \rrbracket[\llbracket \Psi \rrbracket] \llbracket V \rrbracket \\
& \sqsubseteq (\llbracket \langle A \rightarrow \underline{B} \leftarrow A' \rightarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket M' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]] \llbracket V \rrbracket) & \text{(IH)} \\
& \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket M' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]] (\llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket V \rrbracket]) & \text{(cast reduction)} \\
& \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket M' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]] \llbracket V' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket] & \text{(IH)}
\end{aligned}$$

(28) We need to show

$$\frac{\llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket V \rrbracket] \sqsubseteq \llbracket V' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]}{\text{ret } \llbracket V \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA}' \rangle \rrbracket[\text{ret } \llbracket V' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]]}$$

By hom-set definition of adjunction 4.31

(29) We need to show

$$\frac{\begin{aligned} & \llbracket M \rrbracket[\llbracket \Psi \rrbracket] \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA}' \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket M' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]] \\ & \llbracket N \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket N \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]] (\llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket[x/x']) \end{aligned}}{\text{bind } x \leftarrow \llbracket M \rrbracket[\llbracket \Psi \rrbracket]; \llbracket N \rrbracket \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket[\text{bind } x' \leftarrow \llbracket M' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]; \llbracket N' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]]}$$

We proceed:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{bind } x \leftarrow \llbracket M \rrbracket[\llbracket \Psi \rrbracket]; \llbracket N \rrbracket \\
& \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA}' \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket M' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]]; \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket N \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]] (\llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket[x/x']) & \text{(IH, congruence)} \\
& \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \llbracket \langle \underline{FA} \leftarrow \underline{FA}' \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket M' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]]; \\
& \quad \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \text{ret } \llbracket \langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle \rrbracket[x]; \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket N \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]] & (F\beta) \\
& \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x' \leftarrow \llbracket M' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]; \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket[\llbracket N \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]] & \text{(Projection)} \\
& \sqsubseteq \llbracket \langle \underline{B} \leftarrow \underline{B}' \rangle \rrbracket[\text{bind } x' \leftarrow \llbracket M' \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]; \llbracket N \rrbracket[\llbracket \Phi \rrbracket]] & \text{(commuting conversion)}
\end{aligned}$$

□

As a corollary, we have the following conservativity result, which says that the homogeneous term dynamisms in GTT are sound and complete for inequalities in CBPV*.

COROLLARY 4.32 (CONSERVATIVITY). *If $\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash E, E' : T$ are two terms of the same type in the intersection of GTT and CBPV*, then $\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash E \sqsubseteq E' : T$ is provable in GTT iff it is provable in CBPV*.*

PROOF. The reverse direction holds because CBPV* is a syntactic subset of GTT. The forward direction holds by axiomatic graduality and the fact that identity casts are identities. □

$$\begin{aligned}
A &::= X \mid \mu X. A \mid U \underline{B} \mid 0 \mid A_1 + A_2 \mid 1 \mid A_1 \times A_2 \\
\underline{B} &::= \underline{Y} \mid \nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B} \mid \underline{FA} \mid \top \mid \underline{B}_1 \ \& \ \underline{B}_2 \mid A \rightarrow \underline{B} \\
\Gamma &::= \cdot \mid \Gamma, x : A \\
\Delta &::= \cdot \mid \bullet : \underline{B} \\
V &::= x \mid \text{roll}_{\mu X. A} V \mid \text{inl } V \mid \text{inr } V \mid () \mid (V_1, V_2) \mid \text{thunk } M \\
M &::= \underline{U}_B \mid \text{let } x = V; M \mid \text{unroll } V \text{ to } \text{roll } x. M \mid \text{roll}_{\nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B}} M \mid \text{unroll } M \mid \text{abort } V \mid \\
&\quad \text{case } V \{x_1. M_1 \mid x_2. M_2\} \mid \text{split } V \text{ to } (). M \mid \text{split } V \text{ to } (x, y). M \mid \text{force } V \mid \\
&\quad \text{ret } V \mid \text{bind } x \leftarrow M; N \mid \lambda x : A. M \mid M V \mid \{\} \mid \{\pi \mapsto M_1 \mid \pi' \mapsto M_2\} \mid \pi M \mid \pi' M \\
S &::= \bullet \mid \text{bind } x \leftarrow S; M \mid S V \mid \pi S \mid \pi' S \mid \text{unroll}_{\nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B}} S
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 11. Operational CBPV Syntax

5 COMPLEX VALUE/STACK ELIMINATION

Next, to bridge the gap between the semantic notion of complex value and stack with the more rigid operational notion, we perform a complexity-elimination pass. This translates a computation with complex values in it to an equivalent computation without complex values: i.e., all pattern matches take place in computations, rather than in values, and translates a term dynamism derivation that uses complex stacks to one that uses only “simple” stacks without pattern-matching and computation introduction forms. Stacks do not appear anywhere in the grammar of terms, but they are used in the equational theory (computation η rules and error strictness). This translation clarifies the behavioral meaning of complex values and stacks, following [Munch-Maccagnoni \[2014\]](#); [Führmann \[1999\]](#), and therefore of upcasts and downcasts. This is related to completeness of focusing: it moves inversion rules outside of focus phases.

The syntax of operational CBPV is as in Figure 1 (unshaded), but with recursive types added as in Section 4.1, and with values and stacks restricted as in Figure 11.

In CBPV, values include only introduction forms, as usual for values in operational semantics, and CBPV stacks consist only of elimination forms for computation types (the syntax of CBPV enforces an A-normal form, where only values can be pattern-matched on, so `case` and `split` are not evaluation contexts in the operational semantics).

[Levy \[2003\]](#) translates CBPV* to CBPV, but not does not prove the inequality preservation that we require here, so we give an alternative translation for which this property is easy to verify. We translate both complex values and complex stacks to fully general computations, so that computation pattern-matching can replace the pattern-matching in complex values/stacks. For example, for a closed value, we could “evaluate away” the complexity and get a closed simple value (if we don’t use U), but for open terms, evaluation will get “stuck” if we pattern match on a variable—so not every complex value can be translated to a value

$$\begin{array}{c}
\Gamma, x : A, \Gamma' \vdash x \sqsubseteq x : A \qquad \Gamma \mid \bullet : \underline{B} \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \bullet : \underline{B} \qquad \Gamma \vdash \mathcal{U} \sqsubseteq \mathcal{U} : \underline{B} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A \quad \Gamma, x : A \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{let } x = V; M \sqsubseteq \text{let } x = V'; M' : \underline{B}} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : 0}{\Gamma \vdash \text{abort } V \sqsubseteq \text{abort } V' : \underline{B}} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A_1}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inl } V \sqsubseteq \text{inl } V' : A_1 + A_2} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A_2}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inr } V \sqsubseteq \text{inr } V' : A_1 + A_2} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A_1 + A_2 \quad \Gamma, x_1 : A_1 \vdash M_1 \sqsubseteq M'_1 : \underline{B} \quad \Gamma, x_2 : A_2 \vdash M_2 \sqsubseteq M'_2 : \underline{B}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{case } V\{x_1.M_1 \mid x_2.M_2\} \sqsubseteq \text{case } V'\{x_1.M'_1 \mid x_2.M'_2\} : \underline{B}} \\
\\
\Gamma \vdash () \sqsubseteq () : 1 \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash V_1 \sqsubseteq V'_1 : A_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash V_2 \sqsubseteq V'_2 : A_2}{\Gamma \vdash (V_1, V_2) \sqsubseteq (V'_1, V'_2) : A_1 \times A_2} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A_1 \times A_2 \quad \Gamma, x : A_1, y : A_2 \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{split } V \text{ to } (x, y).M \sqsubseteq \text{split } V' \text{ to } (x, y).M' : \underline{B}} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A[\mu X.A/X]}{\Gamma \vdash \text{roll}_{\mu X.A} V \sqsubseteq \text{roll}_{\mu X.A} V' : \mu X.A} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : \mu X.A \quad \Gamma, x : A[\mu X.A/X] \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{unroll } V \text{ to roll } x.M \sqsubseteq \text{unroll } V' \text{ to roll } x.M' : \underline{B}} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{thunk } M \sqsubseteq \text{thunk } M' : \underline{UB}} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : \underline{UB}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{force } V \sqsubseteq \text{force } V' : \underline{B}} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A}{\Gamma \vdash \text{ret } V \sqsubseteq \text{ret } V' : \underline{FA}} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{FA} \quad \Gamma, x : A \vdash N \sqsubseteq N' : \underline{B}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{bind } x \leftarrow M; N \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow M'; N' : \underline{B}} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B}}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : A.M \sqsubseteq \lambda x : A.M' : A \rightarrow \underline{B}} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : A \rightarrow \underline{B} \quad \Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq V' : A}{\Gamma \vdash MV \sqsubseteq M'V' : \underline{B}} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash M_1 \sqsubseteq M'_1 : \underline{B}_1 \quad \Gamma \vdash M_2 \sqsubseteq M'_2 : \underline{B}_2}{\Gamma \vdash \{\pi \mapsto M_1 \mid \pi' \mapsto M_2\} \sqsubseteq \{\pi \mapsto M'_1 \mid \pi' \mapsto M'_2\} : \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2}{\Gamma \vdash \pi M \sqsubseteq \pi M' : \underline{B}_1} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2}{\Gamma \vdash \pi' M \sqsubseteq \pi' M' : \underline{B}_2} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{B}[\underline{vY}.B/\underline{Y}]}{\Gamma \vdash \text{roll}_{\underline{vY}.B} M \sqsubseteq \text{roll}_{\underline{vY}.B} M' : \underline{vY}.B} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash M \sqsubseteq M' : \underline{vY}.B}{\Gamma \vdash \text{unroll } M \sqsubseteq \text{unroll } M' : \underline{B}[\underline{vY}.B/\underline{Y}]}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{case inl } V\{x_1.M_1 \mid x_2.M_2\} \sqsubseteq M_1[V/x_1] \\
\text{case inr } V\{x_1.M_1 \mid x_2.M_2\} \sqsubseteq M_2[V/x_2] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, x : A_1 + A_2 \vdash M : \underline{B}}{\Gamma, x : A_1 + A_2 \vdash M \sqsubseteq \text{case } x\{x_1.M[\text{inl } x_1/x] \mid x_2.M[\text{inr } x_2/x]\} : \underline{B}} \\
\\
\text{split } (V_1, V_2) \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).M \sqsubseteq M[V_1/x_1, V_2/x_2] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, x : A_1 \times A_2 \vdash M : \underline{B}}{\Gamma, x : A_1 \times A_2 \vdash M \sqsubseteq \text{split } x \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).M[(x_1, x_2)/x] : \underline{B}} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, x : 1 \vdash M : \underline{B}}{\Gamma, x : 1 \vdash M \sqsubseteq M[() / x] : \underline{B}} \quad \text{unroll roll}_A V \text{ to roll } x.M \sqsubseteq M[V/x] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, x : \mu X.A \vdash M : \underline{B}}{\Gamma, x : \mu X.A \vdash M \sqsubseteq \text{unroll } x \text{ to roll } y.M[\text{roll}_{\mu X.A} y/x] : \underline{B}} \\
\\
\text{force thunk } M \sqsubseteq M \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash V : U\underline{B}}{\Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq \text{thunk force } V : U\underline{B}} \\
\\
\text{let } x = V; M \sqsubseteq M[V/x] \quad \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } V; M \sqsubseteq M[V/x] \\
\\
\Gamma \mid \bullet : \underline{FA} \vdash \bullet \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } x : \underline{FA} \quad (\lambda x : A.M)V \sqsubseteq M[V/x] \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : A \rightarrow \underline{B}}{\Gamma \vdash M \sqsubseteq \lambda x : A.Mx : A \rightarrow \underline{B}} \quad \pi\{\pi \mapsto M \mid \pi' \mapsto M'\} \sqsubseteq M \\
\\
\pi'\{\pi \mapsto M \mid \pi' \mapsto M'\} \sqsubseteq M' \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2}{\Gamma \vdash M \sqsubseteq \{\pi \mapsto \pi M \mid \pi' \mapsto \pi' M\} : \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash M \sqsubseteq \{\} : \tau} \quad \text{unroll roll}_{\underline{B}} M \sqsubseteq M \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M : \nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B}}{\Gamma \vdash M \sqsubseteq \text{roll}_{\nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B}} \text{ unroll } M : \nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B}}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 13. CBPV β, η rules

in CBPV. More formally, we translate a CBPV* complex value $V : A$ to a CBPV computation $V^\dagger : \underline{FA}$ that in CBPV* is equivalent to $\text{ret } V$. Similarly, we translate a CBPV* complex stack S with hole $\bullet : \underline{B}$ to a CBPV computation S^\dagger with a free

$$\begin{array}{c}
\Gamma \vdash \mathcal{U} \sqsubseteq M : \underline{B} \quad \Gamma \vdash S[\mathcal{U}] \sqsubseteq \mathcal{U} : \underline{B} \quad \Gamma \vdash M \sqsubseteq M : \underline{B} \quad \Gamma \vdash V \sqsubseteq V : A \\
\\
\Gamma \mid \underline{B} \vdash S \sqsubseteq S : \underline{B}' \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash M_1 \sqsubseteq M_2 : \underline{B} \quad \Gamma \vdash M_2 \sqsubseteq M_3 : \underline{B}}{\Gamma \vdash M_1 \sqsubseteq M_3 : \underline{B}} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash V_1 \sqsubseteq V_2 : A \quad \Gamma \vdash V_2 \sqsubseteq V_3 : A}{\Gamma \vdash V_1 \sqsubseteq V_3 : A} \quad \frac{\Gamma \mid \underline{B} \vdash S_1 \sqsubseteq S_2 : \underline{B}' \quad \Gamma \mid \underline{B} \vdash S_2 \sqsubseteq S_3 : \underline{B}'}{\Gamma \mid \underline{B} \vdash S_1 \sqsubseteq S_3 : \underline{B}'} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash M_1 \sqsubseteq M_2 : \underline{B} \quad \Gamma \vdash V_1 \sqsubseteq V_2 : A}{\Gamma \vdash M_1[V_1/x] \sqsubseteq M_2[V_2/x] : \underline{B}} \quad \frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash V'_1 \sqsubseteq V'_2 : A' \quad \Gamma \vdash V_1 \sqsubseteq V_2 : A}{\Gamma \vdash V'_1[V_1/x] \sqsubseteq V'_2[V_2/x] : A'} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma, x : A \mid \underline{B} \vdash S_1 \sqsubseteq S_2 : \underline{B}' \quad \Gamma \vdash V_1 \sqsubseteq V_2 : A}{\Gamma \mid \underline{B} \vdash S_1[V_1/x] \sqsubseteq S_2[V_2/x] : \underline{B}'} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \mid \underline{B} \vdash S_1 \sqsubseteq S_2 : \underline{B}' \quad \Gamma \vdash M_1 \sqsubseteq M_2 : \underline{B}}{\Gamma \vdash S_1[M_1] \sqsubseteq S_2[M_2] : \underline{B}'} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \mid \underline{B}' \vdash S'_1 \sqsubseteq S'_2 : \underline{B}'' \quad \Gamma \mid \underline{B} \vdash S_1 \sqsubseteq S_2 : \underline{B}'}{\Gamma \mid \underline{B} \vdash S'_1[S_1] \sqsubseteq S'_2[S_2] : \underline{B}''}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 14. CBPV logical and error rules

variable $z : U\underline{B}$ such that in CBPV^* , $S^\dagger \sqsubseteq S[\text{force } z]$. Computations $M : \underline{B}$ are translated to computations M^\dagger with the same type.

The *de-complexification* procedure is defined as follows. We note that this translation is not the one presented in [Levy \[2003\]](#), but rather a more inefficient version that, in CPS terminology, introduces many administrative redices. Since we are only proving results up to observational equivalence anyway, the difference doesn't change any of our theorems, and makes some of the proofs simpler.

Definition 5.1 (De-complexification). We define

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bullet^\dagger &= \text{force } z \\
 x^\dagger &= \text{ret } x \\
 (\text{ret } V)^\dagger &= \text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; \text{ret } x \\
 (MV)^\dagger &= \text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; M^\dagger x \\
 (\text{force } V)^\dagger &= \text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; \text{force } x \\
 (\text{absurd } V)^\dagger &= \text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; \text{absurd } x \\
 (\text{case } V\{x_1.E_1 \mid x_2.E_2\})^\dagger &= \text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; \text{case } x\{x_1.E_1^\dagger \mid x_2.E_2^\dagger\} \\
 (\text{split } V \text{ to } ().E)^\dagger &= \text{bind } w \leftarrow V; \text{split } w \text{ to } ().E^\dagger \\
 (\text{split } V \text{ to } (x, y).E)^\dagger &= \text{bind } w \leftarrow V; \text{split } w \text{ to } (x, y).E^\dagger \\
 (\text{unroll } V \text{ to roll } x.E)^\dagger &= \text{bind } y \leftarrow V^\dagger; \text{unroll } y \text{ to roll } x.E^\dagger \\
 (\text{inl } V)^\dagger &= \text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; \text{ret inl } x \\
 (\text{inr } V)^\dagger &= \text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; \text{ret inr } x \\
 ()^\dagger &= \text{ret } () \\
 (V_1, V_2)^\dagger &= \text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow V_1^\dagger; \text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow V_2^\dagger; \text{ret } (x_1, x_2) \\
 (\text{thunk } M)^\dagger &= \text{ret thunk } M^\dagger \\
 (\text{roll } V)^\dagger &= \text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; \text{roll } x
 \end{aligned}$$

The translation is type-preserving and the identity from CBPV*'s point of view

LEMMA 5.2 (DE-COMPLEXIFICATION DE-COMPLEXIFIES). *For any CBPV* term $\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash E : T$, E^\dagger is a term of CBPV satisfying $\Gamma, \Delta^\dagger \vdash E^\dagger : T^\dagger$ where $\cdot^\dagger = \cdot (\bullet : \underline{B})^\dagger = z : U\underline{B}$, $\underline{B}^\dagger = \underline{B}$, $A^\dagger = \underline{FA}$.*

LEMMA 5.3 (DE-COMPLEXIFICATION IS IDENTITY IN CBPV*). *Considering CBPV as a subset of CBPV* we have*

- (1) *If $\Gamma \mid \cdot \vdash M : \underline{B}$ then $M \sqsubseteq M^\dagger$.*
- (2) *If $\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash S : \underline{B}$ then $S[\text{force } z] \sqsubseteq S^\dagger$.*
- (3) *If $\Gamma \vdash V : A$ then $\text{ret } V \sqsubseteq V^\dagger$.*

Furthermore, if M, V, S are in CBPV, the proof holds in CBPV.

Finally, we need to show that the translation preserves inequalities ($E^\dagger \sqsubseteq E'^\dagger$ if $E \sqsubseteq E'$), but because complex values and stacks satisfy more equations than arbitrary computations in the types of their translations do, we need to isolate the special “purity” property that their translations have. We show that complex values are translated to computations that satisfy *thunkability* [Munch-Maccagnoni 2014], which intuitively means M should have no observable effects, and so can be freely duplicated or discarded like a value. In the inequational theory of CBPV, this is defined by saying that running M to a value and then duplicating its value is the same as running M every time we need its value:

Definition 5.4 (Thunkable Computation). A computation $\Gamma \vdash M : \underline{F}A$ is *thunkable* if

$$\Gamma \vdash \text{ret} (\text{thunk } M) \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow M; \text{ret} (\text{thunk} (\text{ret } x)) : \underline{F}\underline{U}\underline{F}A$$

Dually, we show that complex stacks are translated to computations that satisfy (semantic) *linearity* [Munch-Maccagnoni 2014], where intuitively a computation M with a free variable $x : \underline{U}\underline{B}$ is linear in x if M behaves as if when it is forced, the first thing it does is forces x , and that is the only time it uses x . This is described in the CBPV inequational theory as follows: if we have a thunk $z : \underline{U}\underline{F}\underline{U}\underline{B}$, then either we can force it now and pass the result to M as x , or we can just run M with a thunk that will force z each time M is forced—but if M forces x exactly once, first, these two are the same.

Definition 5.5 (Linear Term). A term $\Gamma, x : \underline{U}\underline{B} \vdash M : \underline{C}$ is *linear in x* if

$$\Gamma, z : \underline{U}\underline{F}\underline{U}\underline{B} \vdash \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; M \sqsubseteq M[\text{thunk} (\text{bind } x \leftarrow (\text{force } z); \text{force } x)]$$

Thunkability/linearity of the translations of complex values/stacks are used to prove the preservation of the η principles for positive types and the strictness of complex stacks with respect to errors under decomplexification.

We need a few lemmas about thunkables and linears to prove that complex values become thunkable and complex stacks become linear.

First, the following lemma is useful for optimizing programs with thunkable subterms. Intuitively, since a thunkable has “no effects” it can be reordered past any other effectful binding. Fuhmann [Fuhmann 1999] calls a morphism that has this property *central* (after the center of a group, which is those elements that commute with every element of the whole group).

LEMMA 5.6 (THUNKABLE ARE CENTRAL). *If $\Gamma \vdash M : \underline{F}A$ is thunkable and $\Gamma \vdash N : \underline{F}A'$ and $\Gamma, x : A, y : A' \vdash N' : \underline{B}$, then*

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow M; \text{bind } y \leftarrow N; N' \sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow N; \text{bind } x \leftarrow M; N'$$

PROOF.

$\text{bind } x \leftarrow M; \text{bind } y \leftarrow N; N'$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow M; \text{bind } y \leftarrow N; \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force thunk ret } x; N' \quad (U\beta, \underline{F}\beta)$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow M; \text{bind } w \leftarrow \text{ret thunk ret } x; \text{bind } y \leftarrow N; \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } w; N' \quad (\underline{F}\beta)$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } w \leftarrow (\text{bind } x \leftarrow M; \text{ret thunk ret } x); \text{bind } y \leftarrow N; \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } w; N' \quad (\underline{F}\eta)$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } w \leftarrow \text{ret thunk } M; \text{bind } y \leftarrow N; \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } w; N' \quad (M \text{ thunkable})$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow N; \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force thunk } M; N' \quad (\underline{F}\beta)$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow N; \text{bind } x \leftarrow M; N' \quad (U\beta)$

□

Next, we show thunkables are closed under composition and that return of a value is always thunkable. This allows us to easily build up bigger thunkables from smaller ones.

LEMMA 5.7 (THUNKABLES COMPOSE). *If $\Gamma \vdash M : \underline{F}A$ and $\Gamma, x : A \vdash N : \underline{F}A'$ are thunkable, then*

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow M; N$$

is thunkable.

PROOF.

$\text{bind } y \leftarrow (\text{bind } x \leftarrow M; N); \text{ret thunk ret } y$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow M; \text{bind } y \leftarrow N; \text{ret thunk ret } y \quad (\underline{F}\eta)$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow M; \text{ret thunk } N \quad (N \text{ thunkable})$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow M; \text{ret thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } x; N) \quad (\underline{F}\beta)$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow M; \text{bind } w \leftarrow \text{ret thunk ret } x; \text{ret thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } w; N) \quad (\underline{F}\beta, U\beta)$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } w \leftarrow (\text{bind } x \leftarrow M; \text{ret thunk ret } x); \text{ret thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } w; N) \quad (\underline{F}\eta)$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } w \leftarrow \text{ret thunk } M; \text{ret thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } w; N) \quad (M \text{ thunkable})$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{ret thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force thunk } M; N) \quad (\underline{F}\beta)$

$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{ret thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow M; N) \quad (U\beta)$

□

LEMMA 5.8 (RETURN IS THUNKABLE). *If $\Gamma \vdash V : A$ then $\text{ret } V$ is thunkable.*

PROOF. By $F\beta$:

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } V; \text{ret thunk ret } x \sqsubseteq \text{ret thunk ret } V$$

□

LEMMA 5.9 (COMPLEX VALUES SIMPLIFY TO THUNKABLE TERMS). *If $\Gamma \vdash V : A$ is a (possibly) complex value, then $\Gamma \vdash V^\dagger : \underline{F}A$ is thunkable.*

PROOF. Introduction forms follow from return is thunkable and thunkables compose. For elimination forms it is sufficient to show that when the branches of pattern matching are thunkable, the pattern match is thunkable.

- (1) x : We need to show $x^\dagger = \text{ret } x$ is thunkable, which we proved as a lemma above.
- (2) 0 elim, we need to show

$$\text{bind } y \leftarrow \text{absurd } V; \text{ret thunk ret } y \sqsubseteq \text{ret thunk absurd } V$$

but by $\eta 0$ both sides are equivalent to $\text{absurd } V$.

- (3) $+$ elim, we need to show

$$\text{ret thunk (case } V\{x_1.M_1 \mid x_2.M_2\}) \sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow (\text{case } V\{x_1.M_1 \mid x_2.M_2\}); \text{ret thunk ret } y$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{ret thunk (case } V\{x_1.M_1 \mid x_2.M_2\}) \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{case } V & (+\eta) \\ & \quad \{x_1.\text{ret thunk (case inl } x_1\{x_1.M_1 \mid x_2.M_2\})} \\ & \quad \mid x_2.\text{ret thunk (case inr } x_2\{x_1.M_1 \mid x_2.M_2\})\} \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{case } V & (+\beta) \\ & \quad \{x_1.\text{ret thunk } M_1 \\ & \quad \mid x_2.\text{ret thunk } M_2\} \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{case } V & (M_1, M_2 \text{ thunkable}) \\ & \quad \{x_1.\text{bind } y \leftarrow M_1; \text{ret thunk ret } y \\ & \quad \mid x_2.\text{bind } y \leftarrow M_2; \text{ret thunk ret } y\} \\ & \sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow (\text{case } V\{x_1.M_1 \mid x_2.M_2\}); \text{ret thunk ret } y \\ & \quad \text{(commuting conversion)} \end{aligned}$$

(4) \times elim

$\text{ret thunk (split } V \text{ to } (x, y).M)$
 $\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{split } V \text{ to } (x, y).\text{ret thunk split } (x, y) \text{ to } (x, y).M \quad (\times\eta)$
 $\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{split } V \text{ to } (x, y).\text{ret thunk } M \quad (\times\beta)$
 $\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{split } V \text{ to } (x, y).\text{bind } z \leftarrow M;\text{ret thunk ret } z \quad (M \text{ thunkable})$
 $\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{bind } z \leftarrow (\text{split } V \text{ to } (x, y).M);\text{ret thunk ret } z \quad (\text{commuting conversion})$

(5) 1 elim

$\text{ret thunk (split } V \text{ to } ().xyM)$
 $\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{split } V \text{ to } ().\text{ret thunk split } () \text{ to } ().M \quad (1\eta)$
 $\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{split } V \text{ to } ().\text{ret thunk } M \quad (1\beta)$
 $\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{split } V \text{ to } ().\text{bind } z \leftarrow M;\text{ret thunk ret } z \quad (M \text{ thunkable})$
 $\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{bind } z \leftarrow (\text{split } V \text{ to } ().M);\text{ret thunk ret } z \quad (\text{commuting conversion})$

(6) μ elim

$\text{ret thunk (unroll } V \text{ to roll } x.M)$
 $\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{unroll } V \text{ to roll } x.\text{ret thunk unroll roll } x \text{ to roll } x.M \quad (\mu\eta)$
 $\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{unroll } V \text{ to roll } x.\text{ret thunk } M \quad (\mu\beta)$
 $\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{unroll } V \text{ to roll } x.\text{bind } y \leftarrow M;\text{ret thunk ret } y \quad (M \text{ thunkable})$
 $\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow (\text{unroll } V \text{ to roll } x.M);\text{ret thunk ret } y \quad (\text{commuting conversion})$

□

Dually, we have that a stack out of a force is linear and that linears are closed under composition, so we can easily build up bigger linear morphisms from smaller ones.

LEMMA 5.10 (FORCE TO A STACK IS LINEAR). *If $\Gamma \mid \bullet : \underline{B} \vdash S : \underline{C}$, then $\Gamma, x : U\underline{B} \vdash S[\text{force } x] : \underline{B}$ is linear in x .*

PROOF.

$S[\text{force thunk (bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z;\text{force } x)] \sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq S[(\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z;\text{force } x)] \quad (U\beta)$
 $\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; S[\text{force } x] \quad (F\eta)$

□

LEMMA 5.11 (LINEAR TERMS COMPOSE). *If $\Gamma, x : \underline{UB} \vdash M : \underline{B}'$ is linear in x and $\Gamma, y : \underline{B}' \vdash N : \underline{B}''$ is linear in y , then $\Gamma, x : \underline{UB} \vdash N[\text{thunk } M/y] :$*

PROOF.

$$\begin{aligned}
& N[\text{thunk } M/y][\text{thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{force } x)/x] \\
&= N[\text{thunk } (M[\text{thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{force } x)]/y)] \\
&\sqsubseteq N[\text{thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; M)/y] && (M \text{ linear}) \\
&\sqsubseteq N[\text{thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{force } \text{thunk } M)/y] && (U\beta) \\
&\sqsubseteq N[\text{thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{bind } y \leftarrow \text{ret } \text{thunk } M; \text{force } y)/y] && (F\beta) \\
&\sqsubseteq N[\text{thunk } (\text{bind } y \leftarrow (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{ret } \text{thunk } M); \text{force } y)/y] && (F\eta) \\
&\sqsubseteq N[\text{thunk } (\text{bind } y \leftarrow \text{force } w; \text{force } y)/y][\text{thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{ret } \text{thunk } M)/w] && (U\beta) \\
&\sqsubseteq (\text{bind } y \leftarrow \text{force } w; N)[\text{thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{ret } \text{thunk } M)/w] && (N \text{ linear}) \\
&\sqsubseteq (\text{bind } y \leftarrow (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{ret } \text{thunk } M); N) && (U\beta) \\
&\sqsubseteq (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{bind } y \leftarrow \text{ret } \text{thunk } M; N) && (F\eta) \\
&\sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; N[\text{thunk } M/y]
\end{aligned}$$

□

LEMMA 5.12 (COMPLEX STACKS SIMPLIFY TO LINEAR TERMS). *If $\Gamma \mid \bullet : \underline{B} \vdash S : \underline{C}$ is a (possibly) complex stack, then $\Gamma, z : \underline{UB} \vdash (S)^\dagger : \underline{C}$ is linear in z .*

PROOF. There are 4 classes of rules for complex stacks: those that are rules for simple stacks (\bullet , computation type elimination forms), introduction rules for negative computation types where the subterms are complex stacks, elimination of positive value types where the continuations are complex stacks and finally application to a complex value.

The rules for simple stacks are easy: they follow immediately from the fact that forcing to a stack is linear and that complex stacks compose. For the negative introduction forms, we have to show that binding commutes with introduction forms. For pattern matching forms, we just need commuting conversions. For function application, we use the lemma that binding a thunkable in a linear term is linear.

- (1) \bullet : This is just saying that force z is linear, which we showed above.
- (2) \rightarrow elim We need to show, assuming that $\Gamma, x : \underline{B} \vdash M : \underline{C}$ is linear in x and $\Gamma \vdash N : \underline{FA}$ is thunkable, that

$$\text{bind } y \leftarrow N; M y$$

is linear in x .

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{bind } y \leftarrow N; (M[\text{thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{force } x)/x]) y \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow N; (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; M) y & (M \text{ linear in } x) \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow N; \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; M y & (\underline{F}\eta) \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{bind } y \leftarrow N; M y & (\text{thunkables are central})
 \end{aligned}$$

(3) \rightarrow intro

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \lambda y : A. M[\text{thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{force } x)/x] \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \lambda y : A. \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; M & (M \text{ is linear}) \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \lambda y : A. \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; (\lambda y : A. M) y & (\rightarrow \beta) \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \lambda y : A. (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; (\lambda y : A. M)) y & (\underline{F}\eta) \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; (\lambda y : A. M) & (\rightarrow \eta)
 \end{aligned}$$

(4) \top intro We need to show

$$\text{bind } w \leftarrow \text{force } z; \{ \} \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \{ \}$$

Which is immediate by $\top\eta$

(5) $\&$ intro

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \{ \pi \mapsto M[\text{thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{force } x)/x] \\
 & \mid \pi' \mapsto N[\text{thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{force } x)/x] \} \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \{ \pi \mapsto \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; M & (M, N \text{ linear}) \\
 & \mid \pi' \mapsto \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; N \} \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \{ \pi \mapsto \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \pi \{ \pi \mapsto M \mid \pi' \mapsto N \} & (\&\beta) \\
 & \mid \pi' \mapsto \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \pi' \{ \pi \mapsto M \mid \pi' \mapsto N \} \} \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \{ \pi \mapsto \pi(\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \{ \pi \mapsto M \mid \pi' \mapsto N \}) & (\underline{F}\eta) \\
 & \mid \pi' \mapsto \pi'(\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \{ \pi \mapsto M \mid \pi' \mapsto N \}) \} \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \{ \pi \mapsto M \mid \pi' \mapsto N \} & (\&\eta)
 \end{aligned}$$

(6) ν intro

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{roll } M[\text{thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{force } x)/x] \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{roll } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; M) & (M \text{ is linear}) \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{roll } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{unroll roll } M) & (\nu\beta) \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{roll unroll } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{roll } M) & (\underline{F}\eta) \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; (\text{roll } M) & (\nu\eta)
 \end{aligned}$$

(7) \underline{F} elim: Assume $\Gamma, x : A \vdash M : \underline{F}A'$ and $\Gamma, y : A' \vdash N : \underline{B}$, then we need to show

$$\text{bind } y \leftarrow M; N$$

is linear in M .

$$\text{bind } y \leftarrow M[\text{thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{force } x)/x]; N$$

$$\sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; M); N \quad (M \text{ is linear})$$

$$\sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{bind } y \leftarrow M; N \quad (F\eta)$$

(8) 0 elim: We want to show $\Gamma, x : U\underline{B} \vdash \text{absurd } V : \underline{C}$ is linear in x , which means showing:

$$\text{absurd } V \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{absurd } V$$

which follows from 0η

(9) $+$ elim: Assuming $\Gamma, x : U\underline{B}, y_1 : A_1 \vdash M_1 : \underline{C}$ and $\Gamma, x : U\underline{B}, y_2 : A_2 \vdash M_2 : \underline{C}$ are linear in x , and $\Gamma \vdash V : A_1 + A_2$, we need to show

$$\text{case } V\{y_1.M_1 \mid y_2.M_2\}$$

is linear in x .

case V

$$\{y_1.M_1[\text{thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{force } x)/x]$$

$$\mid y_2.M_2[\text{thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{force } x)/x]\}$$

$$\sqsubseteq \text{case } V\{y_1.\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; M_1 \mid y_2.\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; M_2\}$$

$(M_1, M_2 \text{ linear})$

$$\sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{case } V\{y_1.M_1 \mid y_2.M_2\}$$

(10) \times elim: Assuming $\Gamma, x : U\underline{B}, y_1 : A_1, y_2 : A_2 \vdash M : \underline{B}$ is linear in x and $\Gamma \vdash V : A_1 \times A_2$, we need to show

$$\text{split } V \text{ to } (y_1, y_2).M$$

is linear in x .

$$\text{split } V \text{ to } (y_1, y_2).M[[\text{thunk } (\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{force } x)/x]]$$

$$\sqsubseteq \text{split } V \text{ to } (y_1, y_2).\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; M \quad (M \text{ linear})$$

$$\sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{split } V \text{ to } (y_1, y_2).M \quad (\text{comm. conv})$$

(11) μ elim: Assuming $\Gamma, x : U\underline{B}, y : A[\mu X.A/X] \vdash M : \underline{C}$ is linear in x and $\Gamma \vdash V : \mu X.A$, we need to show

$$\text{unroll } V \text{ to roll } y.M$$

is linear in x .

unroll V to roll $y.M[\text{thunk}(\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{force } x)/x]$

$\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq$ unroll V to roll $y.\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; M$ (M linear)

$\sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq$ $\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{unroll } V \text{ to roll } y.M$ (commuting conversion)

□

Composing this with the previous translation from GTT to CBPV* shows that *GTT value type upcasts are thunkable and computation type downcasts are linear*.

Since the translation takes values and stacks to terms, it cannot preserve substitution up to equality. Rather, we get the following, weaker notion that says that the translation of a syntactic substitution is equivalent to an effectful composition.

LEMMA 5.13 (COMPOSITIONALITY OF DE-COMPLEXIFICATION). (1) *If $\Gamma, x : A \mid \Delta \vdash E : T$ and $\Gamma \vdash V : A$ are complex terms, then*

$$(E[V/x])^\dagger \sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; E^\dagger$$

(2) *If $\Gamma \mid \bullet : \underline{B} \vdash S : \underline{C}$ and $\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash M : \underline{B}$, then*

$$(S[M])^\dagger \sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq S^\dagger[\text{thunk } M^\dagger/z]$$

PROOF. (1) First, note that every occurrence of a variable in E^\dagger is of the form $\text{ret } x$ for some variable x . This means we can define substitution of a *term* for a variable in a simplified term by defining $E^\dagger[N/\text{ret } x]$ to replace every $\text{ret } x : \underline{FA}$ with $N : \underline{FA}$. Then it is an easy observation that simplification is compositional on the nose with respect to this notion of substitution:

$$(E[V/x])^\dagger = E^\dagger[V^\dagger/\text{ret } x]$$

Next by repeated invocation of $U\beta$,

$$E^\dagger[V^\dagger/\text{ret } x] \sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq E^\dagger[\text{force thunk } V^\dagger/\text{ret } x]$$

Then we can lift the definition of the thunk to the top-level by $\underline{F}\beta$:

$$E^\dagger[\text{force thunk } V^\dagger/\text{ret } x] \sqsubseteq\sqsubseteq \text{bind thunk } \leftarrow \text{ret } ; V^\dagger w E^\dagger[\text{force } w/\text{ret } x]$$

Then because V^\dagger is thunkable, we can bind it at the top-level and reduce an administrative redex away to get our desired result:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{bind thunk} \leftarrow \text{ret} ; V^\dagger w E^\dagger [\text{force } w / \text{ret } x] \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger ; \text{bind } w \leftarrow \text{ret thunk ret } x ; E^\dagger [\text{force } w / \text{ret } x] && (V \text{ thunkable}) \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger ; E^\dagger [\text{force thunk ret } x / \text{ret } x] && (F\beta) \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger ; E^\dagger [\text{ret } x / \text{ret } x] && (U\beta) \\
& \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger ; E^\dagger
\end{aligned}$$

- (2) Note that every occurrence of z in S^\dagger is of the form $\text{force } z$. This means we can define substitution of a *term* $M : \underline{B}$ for $\text{force } z$ in S^\dagger by replacing $\text{force } z$ with M . It is an easy observation that simplification is compositional on the nose with respect to this notion of substitution:

$$(S[M/\bullet])^\dagger = S^\dagger[M^\dagger/\text{force } z]$$

Then by repeated $U\beta$, we can replace M^\dagger with a forced thunk:

$$S^\dagger[M^\dagger/\text{force } z] \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq S^\dagger[\text{force thunk } M^\dagger/\text{force } z]$$

which since we are now substituting a force for a force is the same as substituting the thunk for the variable:

$$S^\dagger[\text{force thunk } M^\dagger/\text{force } z] \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq S^\dagger[\text{thunk } M^\dagger/z]$$

□

THEOREM 5.14 (DE-COMPLEXIFICATION PRESERVES DYNAMISM). *If $\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash E \sqsubseteq E' : T$ then $\Gamma, \Delta^\dagger \vdash E^\dagger \sqsubseteq E'^\dagger : T^\dagger$*

PROOF. (1) Reflexivity is translated to reflexivity.

(2) Transitivity is translated to transitivity.

(3) Compatibility rules are translated to compatibility rules.

(4) Substitution of a Value

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : A, \Delta^\dagger \vdash E^\dagger \sqsubseteq E'^\dagger : T^\dagger \quad \Gamma \vdash V^\dagger \sqsubseteq V'^\dagger : \underline{F}A}{\Gamma, \Delta^\dagger \vdash E[V/x]^\dagger \sqsubseteq E'[V'/x]^\dagger : T^\dagger}$$

By the compositionality lemma, it is sufficient to show:

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger ; E^\dagger \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow V'^\dagger ; E'$$

which follows by bind compatibility.

(5) Plugging a term into a hole:

$$\frac{\Gamma, z : U \sqsubseteq \vdash S^\dagger \sqsubseteq S'^\dagger : \underline{B} \quad \Gamma, \Delta^\dagger \vdash M^\dagger \sqsubseteq M'^\dagger : \underline{C}}{\Gamma, \Delta^\dagger \vdash S[M]^\dagger \sqsubseteq S'[M']^\dagger : \underline{B}}$$

By compositionality, it is sufficient to show

$$S^\dagger[\text{thunk } M^\dagger / z] \sqsubseteq S'^\dagger[\text{thunk } M'^\dagger / z]$$

which follows by thunk compatibility and the simple substitution rule.

(6) Stack strictness We need to show for S a complex stack, that

$$(S[\mathcal{U}])^\dagger \sqsubseteq \mathcal{U}$$

By stack compositionality we know

$$(S[\mathcal{U}])^\dagger \sqsubseteq S^\dagger[\text{thunk } \mathcal{U} / z]$$

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket S \rrbracket[\text{thunk } \mathcal{U} / z] &\sqsubseteq S^\dagger[\text{thunk } (\text{bind } y \leftarrow \mathcal{U}; \mathcal{U}) / z] && \text{(Stacks preserve } \mathcal{U}) \\ &\sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow \mathcal{U}; S^\dagger[\text{thunk } \mathcal{U} / z] && (S^\dagger \text{ is linear in } z) \\ &\sqsubseteq \mathcal{U} && \text{(Stacks preserve } \mathcal{U}) \end{aligned}$$

(7) 1β By compositionality it is sufficient to show

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } (); \text{split } x \text{ to } ().E^\dagger \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } (); E^\dagger$$

which follows by $\underline{F}\beta$, 1β .

(8) 1η We need to show for $\Gamma, x : 1 \mid \Delta \vdash E : T$

$$E^\dagger \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } x; \text{split } x \text{ to } ().(E[() / x])^\dagger$$

after a $\underline{F}\beta$, it is sufficient using 1η to prove:

$$(E[() / x])^\dagger \sqsubseteq E^\dagger[() / x]$$

which follows by compositionality and $\underline{F}\beta$:

$$(E[() / x])^\dagger \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } (); E^\dagger \sqsubseteq E^\dagger[() / x]$$

(9) $\times\beta$ By compositionality it is sufficient to show

$$\begin{aligned} \text{bind } x \leftarrow (\text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow V_1^\dagger; \text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow V_2^\dagger; \text{ret } (x_1, x_2)); \text{split } x \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).E^\dagger \\ \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow V_1^\dagger; \text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow V_2^\dagger; E^\dagger \end{aligned}$$

which follows by $\underline{F}\eta$, $\underline{F}\beta$, $\times\beta$.

(10) $\times\eta$ We need to show for $\Gamma, x : A_1 \times A_2 \mid \Delta \vdash E : T$ that

$$E^\dagger \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } x; \text{split } x \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).(E[(x_1, x_2) / x])^\dagger$$

by $\underline{F}\beta$, $\times\eta$ it is sufficient to show

$$E[(x_1, x_2) / x]^\dagger \sqsubseteq E^\dagger[(x_1, x_2) / x]$$

Which follows by compositionality:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & E[(x_1, x_2)/x]^\dagger \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x_1 \leftarrow x_1; \text{bind } x_2 \leftarrow x_2; \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } (x_1, x_2); E^\dagger \quad (\text{compositionality}) \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } (x_1, x_2); E^\dagger \quad (F\beta) \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq E^\dagger[(x_1, x_2)/x]
 \end{aligned}$$

(11) 0η We need to show for any $\Gamma, x : 0 \mid \Delta \vdash E : T$ that

$$E^\dagger \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } x; \text{absurd } x$$

which follows by 0η

(12) $+\beta$ Without loss of generality, we do the inl case By compositionality it is sufficient to show

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow (\text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; \text{inl } x); \text{case } x \{x_1.E_1^\dagger \mid x_2.E_2^\dagger\} \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq E_1[V/x_1]^\dagger$$

which holds by $F\eta, F\beta, +\beta$

(13) $+\eta$ We need to show for any $\Gamma, x : A_1 + A_2 \mid \Delta \vdash E : T$ that

$$E^\dagger \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } x; \text{case } x \{x_1.(E[\text{inl } x_1/x])^\dagger \mid x_2.(E[\text{inl } x_2/x])^\dagger\}$$

$$E^\dagger$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{case } x \{x_1.E^\dagger[\text{inl } x_1/x] \mid x_2.E^\dagger[\text{inl } x_2/x]\} \quad (+\eta) \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{case } x \{x_1.\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret inl } x_1; E^\dagger \mid x_2.\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret inl } x_2; E^\dagger\} \quad (F\beta) \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{case } x \{x_1.E[\text{inl } x_1]/x^\dagger \mid x_2.E[\text{inl } x_2]/x^\dagger\} \quad (\text{compositionality}) \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } x; \text{case } x \{x_1.E[\text{inl } x_1]/x^\dagger \mid x_2.E[\text{inl } x_2]/x^\dagger\} \quad (F\beta)
 \end{aligned}$$

(14) $\mu\beta$ By compositionality it is sufficient to show

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{bind } x \leftarrow (\text{bind } y \leftarrow V^\dagger; \text{ret roll } y); \text{unroll } x \text{ to roll } y.E \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow V^\dagger; E^\dagger
 \end{aligned}$$

which follows by $F\eta, F\beta, \mu\beta$.

(15) $\mu\eta$ We need to show for $\Gamma, x : \mu X.A \mid \Delta \vdash E : T$ that

$$E^\dagger \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } x; \text{unroll } x \text{ to roll } y.(E[\text{roll } y/x])^\dagger$$

by $F\beta, \times\eta$ it is sufficient to show

$$E[\text{roll } y/x]^\dagger \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq E^\dagger[\text{roll } y/x]$$

Which follows by compositionality:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & E[\text{roll } y/x]^\dagger \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } y \leftarrow \text{ret } y; \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret roll } y; E^\dagger & (\text{compositionality}) \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret roll } y; E^\dagger & (\underline{F}\beta) \\
 & \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq E^\dagger[\text{roll } y/x] & (\underline{F}\beta)
 \end{aligned}$$

(16) $U\beta$ We need to show

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } M^\dagger; \text{force } x \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq M^\dagger$$

which follows by $\underline{F}\beta, U\beta$

(17) $U\eta$ We need to show for any $\Gamma \vdash V : U\underline{B}$ that

$$V^\dagger \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{ret thunk (bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; \text{force } x)$$

By compositionality it is sufficient to show

$$V^\dagger \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; \text{ret thunk (bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } x; \text{force } x)$$

which follows by $U\eta$ and some simple reductions:

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; \text{ret thunk (bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } x; \text{force } x)$$

$$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; \text{ret thunk force } x & (\underline{F}\beta)$$

$$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; \text{ret } x & (U\eta)$$

$$\sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq V^\dagger & (\underline{F}\eta)$$

(18) $\rightarrow \beta$ By compositionality it is sufficient to show

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; (\lambda x : A. M^\dagger) x \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; M^\dagger$$

which follows by $\rightarrow \beta$

(19) $\rightarrow \eta$ We need to show

$$z : U(A \rightarrow \underline{B}) \vdash \text{force } z \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \lambda x : A. \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } x; (\text{force } z) x$$

which follows by $\underline{F}\beta, \rightarrow \eta$

(20) $\top \eta$ We need to show

$$z : U\top \vdash \text{force } z \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \{\}$$

which is exactly $\top \eta$.

(21) $\&\beta$ Immediate by simple $\&\beta$.

(22) $\&\eta$ We need to show

$$z : U(\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2) \vdash \text{force } z \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \{ \pi \mapsto \pi \text{force } z \mid \pi' \mapsto \pi' \text{force } z \}$$

which is exactly $\&\eta$

(23) $\nu\beta$ Immediate by simple $\nu\beta$

(24) $\nu\eta$ We need to show

$$z : U(\nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B}) \vdash \text{force } z \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq \text{roll unroll } z$$

which is exactly $\nu\eta$

(25) $\underline{F}\beta$ We need to show

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow V^\dagger; M^\dagger \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq M[V/x]^\dagger$$

which is exactly the compositionality lemma.

(26) $\underline{F}\eta$ We need to show

$$z : U(\underline{F}A) \text{force } z \vdash \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{force } z; \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } x; \text{ret } x$$

which follows by $\underline{F}\beta, \underline{F}\eta$

□

THEOREM 5.15 (COMPLEX CBPV IS CONSERVATIVE OVER CBPV). *If M, M' are terms in CBPV and $M \sqsubseteq M'$ is provable in CBPV^* then $M \sqsubseteq M'$ is provable in CBPV.*

PROOF. Because de-complexification preserves dynamism, $M^\dagger \sqsubseteq M'^\dagger$ in simple CBPV. Then it follows because de-complexification is equivalent to identity (in CBPV):

$$M \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq M^\dagger \sqsubseteq M'^\dagger \sqsubseteq \sqsubseteq M'$$

□

6 OPERATIONAL MODEL OF GTT

In this section, we establish a model of our CBPV inequational theory using a notion of observational approximation based on the CBPV operational semantics. By composition with the axiomatic graduality theorem, this establishes the *operational graduality* theorem, i.e., a theorem analogous to the *dynamic gradual guarantee* [Siek et al. 2015a].

6.1 Call-by-push-value operational semantics

We use a small-step operational semantics for CBPV in figure 15.

This is morally the same as in Levy [2003], but we present stacks in a manner similar to Hieb-Felleisen style evaluation contexts (rather than as an explicit stack machine with stack frames). We also make the step relation count unrollings of a recursive or corecursive type, for the step-indexed logical relation later. The

$S[\mathcal{U}]$	$\mapsto^0 \mathcal{U}$	$\overline{M \Rightarrow^0 M}$
$S[\text{case inl } V\{x_1.M_1 \mid x_2.M_2\}]$	$\mapsto^0 S[M_1[V/x_1]]$	
$S[\text{case inr } V\{x_1.M_1 \mid x_2.M_2\}]$	$\mapsto^0 S[M_2[V/x_2]]$	
$S[\text{split } (V_1, V_2) \text{ to } (x_1, x_2).M]$	$\mapsto^0 S[M[V_1/x_1, V_2/x_2]]$	
$S[\text{unroll roll}_A V \text{ to roll } x.M]$	$\mapsto^1 S[M[V/x]]$	$M_1 \mapsto^i M_2 \quad M_2 \Rightarrow^j M_3$
$S[\text{force thunk } M]$	$\mapsto^0 S[M]$	$M_1 \Rightarrow^{i+j} M_3$
$S[\text{let } x = V; M]$	$\mapsto^0 S[M[V/x]]$	
$S[\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } V; M]$	$\mapsto^0 S[M[V/x]]$	
$S[(\lambda x : A.M) V]$	$\mapsto^0 S[M[V/x]]$	
$S[\pi\{\pi \mapsto M \mid \pi' \mapsto M'\}]$	$\mapsto^0 S[M]$	
$S[\pi'\{\pi \mapsto M \mid \pi' \mapsto M'\}]$	$\mapsto^0 S[M']$	
$S[\text{unroll roll}_B M]$	$\mapsto^1 S[M]$	

Fig. 15. CBPV Operational Semantics

operational semantics is only defined for terms of type $\cdot \vdash M : \underline{F}(1 + 1)$, which we take as the type of whole programs.

We can then observe the following standard operational properties. (We write $M \mapsto N$ with no index when the index is irrelevant.)

LEMMA 6.1 (REDUCTION IS DETERMINISTIC). *If $M \mapsto M_1$ and $M \mapsto M_2$, then $M_1 = M_2$.*

LEMMA 6.2 (SUBJECT REDUCTION). *If $\cdot \vdash M : \underline{F}A$ and $M \mapsto M'$ then $\cdot \vdash M' : \underline{F}A$.*

LEMMA 6.3 (PROGRESS). *If $\cdot \vdash M : \underline{F}A$ then one of the following holds:*

$$M = \mathcal{U} \quad M = \text{ret } V \text{ with } V : A \quad \exists M'. M \mapsto M'$$

The standard progress-and-preservation properties allow us to define the “final result” of a computation as follows:

COROLLARY 6.4 (POSSIBLE RESULTS OF COMPUTATION). *For any $\cdot \vdash M : \underline{F}2$, one of the following is true:*

$$M \Uparrow \quad M \Downarrow \mathcal{U} \quad M \Downarrow \text{ret true} \quad M \Downarrow \text{ret false}$$

PROOF. We define $M \Uparrow$ to hold when if $M \Rightarrow^i N$ then there exists N' with $N \mapsto N'$. For the terminating results, we define $M \Downarrow R$ to hold if there exists some i with $M \Rightarrow^i R$. Then we prove the result by coinduction on execution traces. If $M \in \{\mathcal{U}, \text{ret true}, \text{ret false}\}$ then we are done, otherwise by progress, $M \mapsto M'$, so we need only observe that each of the cases above is preserved by \mapsto . \square

Definition 6.5 (Results). The possible results of a computation are $\Omega, \mathcal{U}, \text{ret true}$ and ret false . We denote a result by R , and define a function result which takes a program $\cdot \vdash M : \underline{F}2$, and returns its end-behavior, i.e., $\text{result}(M) = \Omega$ if $M \Uparrow$ and otherwise $M \Downarrow \text{result}(M)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
C_V &::= [\cdot] \quad \text{roll}_{\mu X.A} C_V \mid \text{inl } C_V \mid \text{inr } C_V \mid (C_V, V) \mid (V, C_V) \mid \text{thunk } C_M \\
C_M &::= [\cdot] \mid \text{let } x = C_V; M \mid \text{let } x = V; C_M \mid \text{unroll } C_V \text{ to roll } x.M \mid \text{unroll } V \text{ to roll } x.M \\
&\quad \mid \text{roll}_{\nu Y.B} C_M \mid \text{unroll } C_M \mid \text{abort } C_V \mid \text{case } C_V \{x_1.M_1 \mid x_2.M_2\} \\
&\quad \mid \text{case } V \{x_1.C_M \mid x_2.C_M\} \mid \text{case } V \{x_1.M_1 \mid x_2.C_M\} \mid \text{split } C_V \text{ to } ().M \\
&\quad \mid \text{split } V \text{ to } ().C_M \mid \text{split } C_V \text{ to } (x, y).M \mid \text{split } V \text{ to } (x, y).C_M \mid \text{force } C_V \\
&\quad \mid \text{ret } C_V \mid \text{bind } x \leftarrow C_M; N \mid \text{bind } x \leftarrow M; C_M \mid \lambda x : A. C_M \mid C_M V \mid M C_V \\
&\quad \mid \{\pi \mapsto C_M \mid \pi' \mapsto M_2\} \mid \{\pi \mapsto M_1 \mid \pi' \mapsto C_M\} \mid \pi C_M \mid \pi' C_M \\
C_S &= \pi C_S \mid \pi' C_S \mid S C_V \mid C_S V \mid \text{bind } x \leftarrow C_S; M \mid \text{bind } x \leftarrow S; C_M
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 16. CBPV Contexts

6.2 Observational Equivalence and Approximation

Next, we define observational equivalence and approximation in CBPV. The (standard) definition of observational equivalence is that we consider two terms (or values) to be equivalent when replacing one with the other in any program text produces the same overall resulting computation. Define a context C to be a term/value/stack with a single $[\cdot]$ as some subterm/value/stack, and define a typing $C : (\Gamma \vdash \underline{B}) \Rightarrow (\Gamma' \vdash \underline{B}')$ to hold when for any $\Gamma \vdash M : \underline{B}$, $\Gamma' \vdash C[M] : \underline{B}'$ (and similarly for values/stacks). Using contexts, we can lift any relation on *results* to relations on open terms, values and stacks.

Definition 6.6 (Contextual Lifting). Given any relation $\sim \subseteq \text{Result}^2$, we can define its *observational lift* \sim^{ctx} to be the typed relation defined by

$$\Gamma \mid \Delta \models E \sim^{\text{ctx}} E' \in T = \forall C : (\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash T) \Rightarrow (\cdot \vdash \underline{F2}). \text{result}(C[E]) \sim \text{result}(C[E'])$$

The contextual lifting \sim^{ctx} inherits much structure of the original relation \sim as the following lemma shows. This justifies calling \sim^{ctx} a contextual preorder when \sim is a preorder (reflexive and transitive) and similarly a contextual equivalence when \sim is an equivalence (preorder and symmetric).

Definition 6.7 (Contextual Preorder, Equivalence). If \sim is reflexive, symmetric or transitive, then for each typing, \sim^{ctx} is reflexive, symmetric or transitive as well, respectively.

In the remainder of the paper we work only with relations that are at least preorders so we write \preceq rather than \sim .

The most famous use of lifting is for observational equivalence, which is the lifting of equality of results ($=^{\text{ctx}}$), and we will show that $\exists \sqsubseteq$ proofs in GTT imply observational equivalences. However, as shown in [New and Ahmed \[2018\]](#), the graduality property is defined in terms of an observational *approximation* relation \sqsubseteq that places \mathbb{U} as the least element, and every other element as a maximal element.




Fig. 17. Result Orderings

Note that this is *not* the standard notion of observational approximation, which we write \leq , which makes Ω a least element and every other element a maximal element. To distinguish these, we call \sqsubseteq *error approximation* and \leq *divergence approximation*. We present these graphically (with two more) in Figure 17.

The goal of this section is to prove that a symmetric equality $E \sqsubseteq E'$ in CBPV (i.e. $E \sqsubseteq E'$ and $E' \sqsubseteq E$) implies contextual equivalence $E =^{\text{ctx}} E'$ and that inequality in CBPV $E \sqsubseteq E'$ implies error approximation $E \sqsubseteq^{\text{ctx}} E'$, proving graduality of the operational model:

$$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash E \sqsubseteq E' : T}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vDash E =^{\text{ctx}} E' \in T} \qquad \frac{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash E \sqsubseteq E' : T}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vDash E \sqsubseteq^{\text{ctx}} E' \in T}$$

Because we have non-well-founded μ/ν types, we use a *step-indexed logical relation* to prove properties about the contextual lifting of certain preorders \sqsubseteq on results. In step-indexing, the *infinitary* relation given by \sqsubseteq^{ctx} is related to the set of all of its

finitary approximations \leq^i , which “time out” after observing i steps of evaluation and declare that the terms *are* related. This means that the original relation is only recoverable from the finite approximations if Ω is always related to another element: if the relation is a preorder, we require that Ω is a *least* element.

We call such a preorder a *divergence preorder*.

Definition 6.8 (Divergence Preorder). A preorder on results \leq is a divergence preorder if $\Omega \leq R$ for all results R .

But this presents a problem, because *neither* of our intended relations ($=$ and \sqsubseteq) is a divergence preorder; rather both have Ω as a *maximal* element.

However, there is a standard “trick” for subverting this obstacle in the case of contextual equivalence [Ahmed 2006]: we notice that we can define equivalence as the symmetrization of divergence approximation, i.e., $M =^{\text{ctx}} N$ if and only if $M \leq^{\text{ctx}} N$ and $N \leq^{\text{ctx}} M$, and since \leq has Ω as a least element, we can use a step-indexed relation to prove it. As shown in New and Ahmed [2018], a similar trick works for error approximation, but since \sqsubseteq is *not* an equivalence relation, we decompose it rather into two *different* orderings: error approximation up to divergence on the left $\leq \sqsubseteq$ and error approximation up to divergence on the right $\sqsubseteq \geq$, also shown in figure 17. Note that $\leq \sqsubseteq$ is a preorder, but not a poset because \mathcal{U}, Ω are order-equivalent but not equal. Then clearly $\leq \sqsubseteq$ is a divergence preorder and the *opposite* of $\sqsubseteq \geq$, written $\leq \sqsupseteq$ is a divergence preorder.

Then we can completely reduce the problem of proving $=^{\text{ctx}}$ and \sqsubseteq^{ctx} results to proving results about divergence preorders by the following observations.

LEMMA 6.9 (DECOMPOSING RESULT PREORDERS). *Let R, S be results.*

- (1) $R = S$ if and only if $R \sqsubseteq S$ and $S \sqsubseteq R$.
- (2) $R = S$ if and only if $R \leq S$ and $S \leq R$.
- (3) $R \leq \sqsubseteq S$ iff $R \sqsubseteq S$ or $R \leq S$.
- (4) $R \sqsubseteq \geq S$ iff $R \sqsubseteq S$ or $R \geq S$.

In the following, we write \sim° for the opposite of a relation ($x \sim^\circ y$ iff $y \sim x$), \Rightarrow for containment/implication ($\sim \Rightarrow \sim'$ iff $x \sim y$ implies $x \sim' y$), \Leftrightarrow for bicontainment/equality, \vee for union ($x(\sim \vee \sim')y$ iff $x \sim y$ or $x \sim' y$), and \wedge for intersection ($x(\sim \wedge \sim')y$ iff $x \sim y$ and $x \sim' y$).

LEMMA 6.10 (CONTEXTUAL LIFT COMMUTES WITH CONJUNCTION).

$$(\sim_1 \wedge \sim_2)^{\text{ctx}} \Leftrightarrow \sim_1^{\text{ctx}} \wedge \sim_2^{\text{ctx}}$$

LEMMA 6.11 (CONTEXTUAL LIFT COMMUTES WITH DUALIZATION).

$$\sim^{\circ \text{ctx}} \Leftrightarrow \sim^{\text{ctx}^\circ}$$

LEMMA 6.12 (CONTEXTUAL DECOMPOSITION LEMMA). *Let \sim be a reflexive relation ($= \Rightarrow \sim$), and \leq be a reflexive, antisymmetric relation ($= \Rightarrow \leq$ and $(\leq \wedge \leq^\circ) \Leftrightarrow =$). Then*

$$\sim^{ctx} \Leftrightarrow (\sim \vee \leq)^{ctx} \wedge ((\sim^\circ \vee \leq)^{ctx})^\circ$$

PROOF. Note that despite the notation, \leq need not be assumed to be transitive. Reflexive relations form a lattice with \wedge and \vee with $=$ as \perp and the total relation as \top (e.g. $(= \vee \sim) \Leftrightarrow \sim$ because \sim is reflexive, and $(= \wedge \sim) \Leftrightarrow =$). So we have

$$\sim \Leftrightarrow (\sim \vee \leq) \wedge (\sim \vee \leq^\circ)$$

because FOILING the right-hand side gives

$$(\sim \wedge \sim) \vee (\leq \wedge \sim) \vee (\sim \wedge \leq^\circ) \vee (\leq \wedge \leq^\circ)$$

By antisymmetry, $(\leq \wedge \leq^\circ)$ is $=$, which is the unit of \vee , so it cancels. By idempotence, $(\sim \wedge \sim)$ is \sim . Then by absorption, the whole thing is \sim .

Opposite is *not* de Morgan: $(P \vee Q)^\circ = P^\circ \vee Q^\circ$, and similarly for \wedge . But it is involutive: $(P^\circ)^\circ \Leftrightarrow P$.

So using Lemmas 6.10, 6.11 we can calculate as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sim^{ctx} &\Leftrightarrow ((\sim \vee \leq) \wedge (\sim \vee \leq^\circ))^{ctx} \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\sim \vee \leq)^{ctx} \wedge (\sim \vee \leq^\circ)^{ctx} \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\sim \vee \leq)^{ctx} \wedge ((\sim \vee \leq^\circ)^\circ)^{ctx} \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\sim \vee \leq)^{ctx} \wedge ((\sim^\circ \vee (\leq^\circ)^\circ)^\circ)^{ctx} \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\sim \vee \leq)^{ctx} \wedge (\sim^\circ \vee \leq)^\circ \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\sim \vee \leq)^{ctx} \wedge (\sim^\circ \vee \leq)^{ctx^\circ} \end{aligned}$$

□

As a corollary, the decomposition of contextual equivalence into diverge approximation in Ahmed [2006] and the decomposition of dynamism in New and Ahmed [2018] are really the same trick:

COROLLARY 6.13 (CONTEXTUAL DECOMPOSITION).

- (1) $=^{ctx} \Leftrightarrow \leq^{ctx} \wedge ((\leq)^{ctx})^\circ$
- (2) $=^{ctx} \Leftrightarrow \sqsubseteq^{ctx} \wedge ((\sqsubseteq)^{ctx})^\circ$
- (3) $\sqsubseteq^{ctx} \Leftrightarrow \leq \sqsubseteq^{ctx} \wedge ((\leq \sqsubseteq)^{ctx})^\circ$

PROOF. For part 1 (though we will not use this below), applying Lemma 6.12 with \sim taken to be $=$ (which is reflexive) and \leq taken to be \leq (which is reflexive and antisymmetric) gives that contextual equivalence is symmetric contextual divergence approximation:

$$=^{ctx} \Leftrightarrow (= \vee \leq)^{ctx} \wedge ((= \vee \leq)^{ctx})^\circ \Leftrightarrow \leq^{ctx} \wedge ((\leq)^{ctx})^\circ$$

For part (2), the same argument with \sim taken to be $=$ and \leq taken to be \sqsubseteq (which is also antisymmetric) gives that contextual equivalence is symmetric contextual dynamism:

$$=^{\text{ctx}} \Leftrightarrow \sqsubseteq^{\text{ctx}} \wedge ((\sqsubseteq)^{\text{ctx}})^{\circ}$$

For part (3), applying Lemma 6.12 with \sim taken to be \sqsubseteq and \leq taken to be \leq gives that dynamism decomposes as

$$\sqsubseteq^{\text{ctx}} \Leftrightarrow (\sqsubseteq \vee \leq)^{\text{ctx}} \wedge ((\sqsubseteq^{\circ} \vee \leq)^{\text{ctx}})^{\circ} \Leftrightarrow \leq \sqsubseteq^{\text{ctx}} \wedge ((\leq \sqsupset)^{\text{ctx}})^{\circ}$$

Since both $\leq \sqsubseteq$ and $\leq \sqsupset$ are of the form $-\vee \leq$, both are divergence preorders. Thus, it suffices to develop logical relations for divergence preorders below. \square

6.3 CBPV Step Indexed Logical Relation

Next, we turn to the problem of proving results about $E \trianglelefteq^{\text{ctx}} E'$ where \trianglelefteq is a divergence preorder. Dealing directly with a contextual preorder is practically impossible, so instead we develop an alternative formulation as a logical relation that is much easier to use. Fortunately, we can apply standard logical relations techniques to provide an alternate definition *inductively* on types. However, since we have non-well-founded type definitions using μ and ν , our logical relation will also be defined inductively on a *step index* that times out when we've exhausted our step budget. To bridge the gap between the indexed logical relation and the divergence preorder we care about, we define the “finitization” of a divergence preorder to be a relation between *programs* and *results*: the idea is that a program approximates a result R at index i if it reduces to R in less than i steps or it reduces at least i times.

Definition 6.14 (Finitized Preorder). Given a divergence preorder \trianglelefteq , we define the *finitization* of \trianglelefteq to be, for each natural number i , a relation between programs and results

$$\trianglelefteq^i \subseteq \{M \mid \cdot \vdash M : \underline{F2}\} \times \text{Results}$$

defined by

$$M \trianglelefteq^i R = (\exists M'. M \Rightarrow^i M') \vee (\exists (j < i). \exists R_M. M \Rightarrow^j R_M \wedge R_M \trianglelefteq R)$$

Note that in this definition, unlike in the definition of divergence, we only count non-well-founded steps. This makes it slightly harder to establish the intended equivalence $M \trianglelefteq^{\omega} R$ if and only if $\text{result}(M) \trianglelefteq R$, but makes the logical relation theorem stronger: it proves that diverging terms must use recursive types of some sort and so any term that does not use them terminates. This issue would be alleviated if we had proved type safety by a logical relation rather than by progress and preservation.

However, the following properties of the indexed relation can easily be established. First, a kind of “transitivity” of the indexed relation with respect to the original preorder, which is key to proving transitivity of the logical relation.

LEMMA 6.15 (INDEXED RELATION IS A MODULE OF THE PREORDER). *If $M \leq^i R$ and $R \leq R'$ then $M \leq^i R'$*

PROOF. If $M \Rightarrow^i M'$ then there's nothing to show, otherwise $M \Rightarrow^{j < i} \text{result}(M)$ so it follows by transitivity of the preorder: $\text{result}(M) \leq R \leq R'$. \square

Then we establish a few basic properties of the finitized preorder.

LEMMA 6.16 (DOWNWARD CLOSURE OF FINITIZED PREORDER). *If $M \leq^i R$ and $j \leq i$ then $M \leq^j R$.*

PROOF.

- (1) If $M \Rightarrow^i M_i$ then $M \Rightarrow^j M_j$ and otherwise
- (2) If $M \Rightarrow^{j \leq ki} \text{result}(M)$ then $M \Rightarrow^j M_j$
- (3) if $M \Rightarrow^{k < j \leq i} \text{result}(M)$ then $\text{result}(M) \leq R$.

\square

LEMMA 6.17 (TRIVIALITY AT 0). *For any $\cdot \vdash M : \underline{F}2$, $M \leq^0 R$*

PROOF. Because $M \Rightarrow^0 M$

\square

LEMMA 6.18 (RESULT (ANTI-)REDUCTION). *If $M \Rightarrow^i N$ then $\text{result}(M) = \text{result}(N)$.*

LEMMA 6.19 (ANTI-REDUCTION). *If $M \leq^i R$ and $N \Rightarrow^j M$, then $N \leq^{i+j} R$*

PROOF. (1) If $M \Rightarrow^i M'$ then $N \Rightarrow^{i+j} M'$

- (2) If $M \Rightarrow^{k < i} \text{result}(M)$ then $N \Rightarrow^{k+j} \text{result}(M)$ and $\text{result}(M) = \text{result}(N)$ and $k + j < i + j$.

\square

Next, we define the (closed) *logical* preorder (for closed values/stacks) by induction on types and the index i in figure 18. Specifically, for every i and value type A we define a relation $\leq_{A,i}^{\text{log}}$ between closed values of type A because these are the only ones that will be pattern-matched against at runtime. The relation is defined in a type-directed fashion, the intuition being that we relate two positive values when they are built up in the same way: i.e., they have the same introduction form and their subterms are related. For μ , this definition would not be well-founded, so we decrement the step index, giving up and relating the terms if $i = 0$. Finally U is the only negative value type, and so it is treated differently. A thunk $V : U\bar{B}$ cannot be inspected by pattern matching, rather the only way to interact with it is to force its evaluation. By the definition of the operational semantics, this only ever occurs in the step $S[\text{force } V]$, so (ignoring indices for a moment), we should

$$\begin{aligned}
\trianglelefteq_{A,i}^{\log} &\subseteq \{\cdot \vdash V : A\}^2 & \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B},i}^{\log} &\subseteq \{\cdot \mid \underline{B} \vdash S : \underline{F}(1+1)\}^2 \\
\cdot \trianglelefteq_{\cdot,i}^{\log} \cdot &= \top \\
\gamma_1, V_1/x \trianglelefteq_{\Gamma, x:A,i}^{\log} \gamma_2, V_2/x &= \gamma_1 \trianglelefteq_{\Gamma,i}^{\log} \gamma_2 \wedge V_1 \trianglelefteq_{A,i}^{\log} V_2 \\
V_1 \trianglelefteq_{0,i}^{\log} V_2 &= \perp \\
\text{inl } V_1 \trianglelefteq_{A+A',i}^{\log} \text{inl } V_2 &= V_1 \trianglelefteq_{A,i}^{\log} V_2 \\
\text{inr } V_1 \trianglelefteq_{A+A',i}^{\log} \text{inr } V_2 &= V_1 \trianglelefteq_{A',i}^{\log} V_2 \\
() \trianglelefteq_{1,i}^{\log} () &= \top \\
(V_1, V'_1) \trianglelefteq_{A \times A',i}^{\log} (V_2, V'_2) &= V_1 \trianglelefteq_{A,i}^{\log} V_2 \wedge V'_1 \trianglelefteq_{A',i}^{\log} V'_2 \\
\text{roll}_{\mu X.A} V_1 \trianglelefteq_{\mu X.A,i}^{\log} \text{roll}_{\mu X.A} V_2 &= i = 0 \vee V_1 \trianglelefteq_{A[\mu X.A/X],i-1}^{\log} V_2 \\
V_1 \trianglelefteq_{\underline{U}\underline{B},i}^{\log} V_2 &= \forall j \leq i, S_1 \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B},j}^{\log} S_2. S_1[\text{force } V_1] \trianglelefteq^j \text{result}(S_2[\text{force } V_2]) \\
S_1[\bullet V_1] \trianglelefteq_{A \rightarrow \underline{B},i}^{\log} S_1[\bullet V_2] &= V_1 \trianglelefteq_{A,i}^{\log} V_2 \wedge S_1 \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B},i}^{\log} S_2 \\
S_1[\pi_1 \bullet] \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B} \& \underline{B}',i}^{\log} S_2[\pi_1 \bullet] &= S_1 \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B},i}^{\log} S_2 \\
S_1[\pi_2 \bullet] \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B} \& \underline{B}',i}^{\log} S_2[\pi_2 \bullet] &= S_1 \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B}',i}^{\log} S_2 \\
S_1 \trianglelefteq_{\top,i}^{\log} S_2 &= \perp \\
S_1[\text{unroll } \bullet] \trianglelefteq_{\nu \underline{Y}.\underline{B},i}^{\log} S_2[\text{unroll } \bullet] &= i = 0 \vee S_1 \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B}[\nu \underline{Y}.\underline{B}/\underline{Y}],i-1}^{\log} S_2 \\
S_1 \trianglelefteq_{\underline{F}A,i}^{\log} S_2 &= \forall j \leq i, V_1 \trianglelefteq_{A,j}^{\log} V_2. S_1[\text{ret } V_1] \trianglelefteq^j \text{result}(S_2[\text{ret } V_2])
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 18. Logical Relation from a Preorder \trianglelefteq

define $V_1 \trianglelefteq V_2$ to hold in this case when, given $S_1 \trianglelefteq S_2$, the result of $S_2[\text{force } V_2]$ is approximated by $S_1[\text{force } V_1]$. To incorporate the indices, we have to quantify over $j \leq i$ in this definition because we need to know that the values are related in all futures, including ones where some other part of the term has been reduced (consuming some steps). Technically, this is crucial for making sure the relation is downward-closed. This is known as the *orthogonal* of the relation, and one advantage of the CBPV language is that it makes the use of orthogonality *explicit* in the type structure, analogous to the benefits of using Nakano’s *later* modality [Nakano n. d.] for step indexing (which we ironically do not do).

Next, we define when two *stacks* are related. First, we define the relation only for two “closed” stacks, which both have the same type of their hole \underline{B} and both have “output” the observation type $\underline{F}2$. The reason is that in evaluating a program M , steps always occur as $S[N] \Rightarrow S[N']$ where S is a stack of this form. An intuition is that for negative types, two stacks are related when they start with the same elimination form and the remainder of the stacks are related. For ν , we handle the step indices in the same way as for μ . For $\underline{F}A$, a stack $S[\bullet : \underline{F}A]$ is strict in its input

and waits for its input to evaluate down to a value $\text{ret } V$, so two stacks with \underline{FA} holes are related when in any future world, they produce related behavior when given related values.

We note that in the CBV restriction of CBPV, the function type is given by $U(A \rightarrow \underline{FA'})$ and the logical relation we have presented reconstructs the usual definition that involves a double orthogonal.

Note that the definition is well-founded using the lexicographic ordering on (i, A) and (i, B) : either the type reduces and the index stays the same or the index reduces. We extend the definition to contexts to *closing substitutions* pointwise: two closing substitutions for Γ are related at i if they are related at i for each $x : A \in \Gamma$.

The logical preorder for open terms is defined as usual by quantifying over all related closing substitutions, but also over all stacks to the observation type $\underline{F}(1 + 1)$:

Definition 6.20 (Logical Preorder). For a divergence preorder \trianglelefteq , its step-indexed logical preorder is

- (1) $\Gamma \models M_1 \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M_2 \in \underline{B}$ iff for every $\gamma_1 \trianglelefteq_{\Gamma, i}^{\log} \gamma_2$ and $S_1 \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B}, i}^{\log} S_2$, $S_1[M_1[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[M_2[\gamma_2]])$.
- (2) $\Gamma \models V_1 \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V_2 \in A$ iff for every $\gamma_1 \trianglelefteq_{\Gamma, i}^{\log} \gamma_2$, $V_1[\gamma_1] \trianglelefteq_{A, i}^{\log} V_2[\gamma_2]$
- (3) $\Gamma \mid \underline{B} \models S_1 \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} S_2 \in \underline{B'}$ iff for every $\gamma_1 \trianglelefteq_{\Gamma, i}^{\log} \gamma_2$ and $S'_1 \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B'}, i}^{\log} S'_2$, $S'_1[S_1[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B}, i}^{\log} S'_2[S_2[\gamma_2]]$.

We next want to prove that the logical preorder is a congruence relation, i.e., the fundamental lemma of the logical relation. This requires the easy lemma, that the relation on closed terms and stacks is downward closed.

LEMMA 6.21 (LOGICAL RELATION DOWNWARD CLOSURE). *For any type T , if $j \leq i$ then $\trianglelefteq_{T, i}^{\log} \subseteq \trianglelefteq_{T, j}^{\log}$*

Next, we show the fundamental theorem:

THEOREM 6.22 (LOGICAL PREORDER IS A CONGRUENCE). *For any divergence preorder, the logical preorder $E \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} E'$ is a congruence relation, i.e., it is closed under applying any value/term/stack constructors to both sides.*

PROOF. For each congruence rule

$$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash E_1 \sqsubseteq E'_1 : T_1 \cdots}{\Gamma' \mid \Delta' \vdash E_c \sqsubseteq E'_c : T_c}$$

we prove for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ the validity of the rule

$$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Delta \models E_1 \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} E'_1 \in T_1 \cdots}{\Gamma \mid \Delta \models E_c \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} E'_c \in T_c}$$

- (1) $\Gamma, x : A, \Gamma' \models x \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} x \in A$. Given $\gamma_1 \trianglelefteq_{\Gamma, x:A, \Gamma', i}^{\log} \gamma_2$, then by definition $\gamma_1(x) \trianglelefteq_{A, i}^{\log} \gamma_2(x)$.
- (2) $\Gamma \models \mathcal{U} \trianglelefteq_{\epsilon, \mathcal{U}}^{\log} \underline{B}$ We need to show $S_1[\mathcal{U}] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[\mathcal{U}])$. By anti-reduction and strictness of stacks, it is sufficient to show $\mathcal{U} \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \mathcal{U}$. If $i = 0$ there is nothing to show, otherwise, it follows by reflexivity of \trianglelefteq .
- (3) $\frac{\Gamma \models V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V' \in A \quad \Gamma, x : A \models M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M' \in \underline{B}}{\Gamma \models \text{let } x = V; M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \text{let } x = V'; M' \in \underline{B}}$
 Each side takes a 0-cost step, so by anti-reduction, this reduces to

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1, V/x]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[M'[\gamma_2, V'/x]])$$

which follows by the assumption $\Gamma, x : A \models M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M' \in \underline{B}$

- (4) $\frac{\Gamma \models V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V' \in 0}{\Gamma \models \text{abort } V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \text{abort } V' \in \underline{B}}$. By assumption, we get $V[\gamma_1] \lesssim_{0, \perp}^i V'[\gamma_2]$, but this is a contradiction.
- (5) $\frac{\Gamma \models V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V' \in A_1}{\Gamma \models \text{inl } V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \text{inl } V' \in A_1 + A_2}$. Direct from assumption, rule for sums.
- (6) $\frac{\Gamma \models V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V' \in A_2}{\Gamma \models \text{inr } V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \text{inr } V' \in A_1 + A_2}$ Direct from assumption, rule for sums.
- (7) $\frac{\Gamma \models V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V' \in A_1 + A_2 \quad \Gamma, x_1 : A_1 \models M_1 \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M'_1 \in \underline{B} \quad \Gamma, x_2 : A_2 \models M_2 \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M'_2 \in \underline{B}}{\Gamma \models \text{case } V\{x_1.M_1 \mid x_2.M_2\} \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \text{case } V'\{x_1.M'_1 \mid x_2.M'_2\} \in \underline{B}}$

By case analysis of $V[\gamma_1] \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V'[\gamma_2]$.

- (a) If $V[\gamma_1] = \text{inl } V_1, V'[\gamma_2] = \text{inl } V'_1$ with $V_1 \trianglelefteq_{A_1, i}^{\log} V'_1$, then taking 0 steps, by anti-reduction the problem reduces to

$$S_1[M_1[\gamma_1, V_1/x_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_1[M_1[\gamma_1, V_1/x_1]])$$

which follows by assumption.

- (b) For inr , the same argument.

- (8) $\Gamma \models () \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} () \in 1$ Immediate by unit rule.
- (9) $\frac{\Gamma \models V_1 \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V'_1 \in A_1 \quad \Gamma \models V_2 \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V'_2 \in A_2}{\Gamma \models (V_1, V_2) \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} (V'_1, V'_2) \in A_1 \times A_2}$ Immediate by pair rule.
- (10) $\frac{\Gamma \models V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V' \in A_1 \times A_2 \quad \Gamma, x : A_1, y : A_2 \models M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M' \in \underline{B}}{\Gamma \models \text{split } V \text{ to } (x, y).M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \text{split } V' \text{ to } (x, y).M' \in \underline{B}}$ By $V \trianglelefteq_{A_1 \times A_2, i}^{\log}$
 V' , we know $V[\gamma_1] = (V_1, V_2)$ and $V'[\gamma_2] = (V'_1, V'_2)$ with $V_1 \trianglelefteq_{A_1, i}^{\log} V'_1$ and

$V_2 \trianglelefteq_{A_2, i}^{\log} V'_2$. Then by anti-reduction, the problem reduces to

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1, V_1/x, V_2/y]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_1[M'[\gamma_1, V'_1/x, V'_2/y]])$$

which follows by assumption.

- (11)
$$\frac{\Gamma \models V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V' \in A[\mu X.A/X]}{\Gamma \models \text{roll}_{\mu X.A} V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \text{roll}_{\mu X.A} V' \in \mu X.A}$$
 If $i = 0$, we're done. Otherwise $i = j + 1$, and our assumption is that $V[\gamma_1] \trianglelefteq_{A[\mu X.A/X], j+1}^{\log} V'[\gamma_2]$ and we need to show that $\text{roll } V[\gamma_1] \trianglelefteq_{\mu X.A, j+1}^{\log} \text{roll } V'[\gamma_2]$. By definition, we need to show $V[\gamma_1] \trianglelefteq_{A[\mu X.A/X], j}^{\log} V'[\gamma_2]$, which follows by downward-closure.
- (12)
$$\frac{\Gamma \models V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V' \in \mu X.A \quad \Gamma, x : A[\mu X.A/X] \models M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M' \in \underline{B}}{\Gamma \models \text{unroll } V \text{ to roll } x.M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \text{unroll } V' \text{ to roll } x.M' \in \underline{B}}$$
 If $i = 0$, then by triviality at 0, we're done. Otherwise, $V[\gamma_1] \trianglelefteq_{\mu X.A, j+1}^{\log} V'[\gamma_2]$ so $V[\gamma_1] = \text{roll } V_\mu, V'[\gamma_2] = \text{roll } V'_\mu$ with $V_\mu \trianglelefteq_{A[\mu X.A/X], j}^{\log} V'_\mu$. Then each side takes 1 step, so by anti-reduction it is sufficient to show

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1, V_\mu/x]] \trianglelefteq^j \text{result}(S_2[M'[\gamma_2, V'_\mu/x]])$$

which follows by assumption and downward closure of the stack, value relations.

- (13)
$$\frac{\Gamma \models M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M' \in \underline{B}}{\Gamma \models \text{thunk } M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \text{thunk } M' \in \underline{UB}}$$
. We need to show $\text{thunk } M[\gamma_1] \trianglelefteq_{\underline{UB}, i}^{\log} \text{thunk } M'[\gamma_2]$, so let $S_1 \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B}, j}^{\log} S_2$ for some $j \leq i$, and we need to show

$$S_1[\text{force thunk } M_1[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^j \text{result}(S_2[\text{force thunk } M_2[\gamma_2]])$$

Then each side reduces in a 0-cost step and it is sufficient to show

$$S_1[M_1[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^j \text{result}(S_2[M_2[\gamma_2]])$$

Which follows by downward-closure for terms and substitutions.

- (14)
$$\frac{\Gamma \models V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V' \in \underline{UB}}{\Gamma \models \text{force } V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \text{force } V' \in \underline{B}}$$
. We need to show $S_1[\text{force } V[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[\text{force } V'[\gamma_2]])$, which follows by the definition of $V[\gamma_1] \trianglelefteq_{\underline{UB}, i}^{\log} V'[\gamma_2]$.

$$(15) \frac{\Gamma \models V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V' \in A}{\Gamma \models \text{ret } V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \text{ret } V' \in \underline{FA}}$$

We need to show $S_1[\text{ret } V[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[\text{ret } V'[\gamma_2]])$, which follows by the orthogonality definition of $S_1 \trianglelefteq_{\underline{FA},i}^{\log} S_2$.

$$(16) \frac{\Gamma \models M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M' \in \underline{FA} \quad \Gamma, x : A \models N \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} N' \in \underline{B}}{\Gamma \models \text{bind } x \leftarrow M; N \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \text{bind } x \leftarrow M'; N' \in \underline{B}}.$$

We need to show $\text{bind } x \leftarrow M[\gamma_1]; N[\gamma_2] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(\text{bind } x \leftarrow M'[\gamma_2]; N'[\gamma_2])$. By $M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M' \in \underline{FA}$, it is sufficient to show that

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; N[\gamma_1] \trianglelefteq_{\underline{FA},i}^{\log} \text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; N'[\gamma_2]$$

So let $j \leq i$ and $V \trianglelefteq_{A,j}^{\log} V'$, then we need to show

$$\text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } V; N[\gamma_1] \trianglelefteq_{\underline{FA},j}^{\log} \text{bind } x \leftarrow \text{ret } V'; N'[\gamma_2]$$

By anti-reduction, it is sufficient to show

$$N[\gamma_1, V/x] \trianglelefteq^j \text{result}(N'[\gamma_2, V'/x])$$

which follows by anti-reduction for $\gamma_1 \trianglelefteq_{\Gamma,i}^{\log} \gamma_2$ and $N \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} N'$.

$$(17) \frac{\Gamma, x : A \models M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M' \in \underline{B}}{\Gamma \models \lambda x : A. M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \lambda x : A. M' \in A \rightarrow \underline{B}} \text{ We need to show}$$

$$S_1[\lambda x : A. M[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[\lambda x : A. M'[\gamma_2]]).$$

By $S_1 \trianglelefteq_{A \rightarrow \underline{B},i}^{\log} S_2$, we know $S_1 = S'_1[\bullet V_1]$, $S_2 = S'_2[\bullet V_2]$ with $S'_1 \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B},i}^{\log} S'_2$ and $V_1 \trianglelefteq_{A,i}^{\log} V_2$. Then by anti-reduction it is sufficient to show

$$S'_1[M[\gamma_1, V_1/x]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S'_2[M'[\gamma_2, V_2/x]])$$

which follows by $M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M'$.

$$(18) \frac{\Gamma \models M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M' \in A \rightarrow \underline{B} \quad \Gamma \models V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V' \in A}{\Gamma \models M V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M' V' \in \underline{B}} \text{ We need to show}$$

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1] V[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[M'[\gamma_2] V'[\gamma_2]])$$

so by $M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M'$ it is sufficient to show $S_1[\bullet V[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq_{A \rightarrow \underline{B},i}^{\log} S_2[\bullet V'[\gamma_2]]$ which follows by definition and assumption that $V \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V'$.

$$(19) \Gamma \vdash \{ \} : \top \text{ We assume we are given } S_1 \trianglelefteq_{\top,i}^{\log} S_2, \text{ but this is a contradiction.}$$

$$(20) \frac{\Gamma \models M_1 \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M'_1 \in \underline{B}_1 \quad \Gamma \models M_2 \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M'_2 \in \underline{B}_2}{\Gamma \models \{\pi \mapsto M_1 \mid \pi' \mapsto M_2\} \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \{\pi \mapsto M'_1 \mid \pi' \mapsto M'_2\} \in \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2} \text{ We need to show}$$

$$S_1[\{\pi \mapsto M_1[\gamma_1] \mid \pi' \mapsto M_2[\gamma_1]\}] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[\{\pi \mapsto M'_1[\gamma_1] \mid \pi' \mapsto M'_2[\gamma_2]\}]).$$

We proceed by case analysis of $S_1 \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2, i}^{\log} S_2$

(a) In the first possibility $S_1 = S'_1[\pi \bullet]$, $S_2 = S'_2[\pi \bullet]$ and $S'_1 \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B}_1, i}^{\log} S'_2$. Then by anti-reduction, it is sufficient to show

$$S'_1[M_1[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S'_2[M'_1[\gamma_2]])$$

which follows by $M_1 \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M'_1$.

(b) Same as previous case.

$$(21) \frac{\Gamma \models M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M' \in \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2}{\Gamma \models \pi M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \pi M' \in \underline{B}_1} \text{ We need to show } S_1[\pi M[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[\pi M'[\gamma_2]]),$$

which follows by $S_1[\pi \bullet] \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2, i}^{\log} S_2[\pi \bullet]$ and $M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M'$.

$$(22) \frac{\Gamma \models M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M' \in \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2}{\Gamma \models \pi' M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \pi' M' \in \underline{B}_2} \text{ Similar to previous case.}$$

$$(23) \frac{\Gamma \models M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M' \in \underline{B}[\nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B} / \underline{Y}]}{\Gamma \models \text{roll}_{\nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B}} M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \text{roll}_{\nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B}} M' \in \nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B}} \text{ We need to show that}$$

$$S_1[\text{roll}_{\nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B}} M[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[\text{roll}_{\nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B}} M'[\gamma_2]])$$

If $i = 0$, we invoke triviality at 0. Otherwise, $i = j + 1$ and we know by $S_1 \trianglelefteq_{\nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B}, j+1}^{\log} S_2$ that $S_1 = S'_1[\text{unroll } \bullet]$ and $S_2 = S'_2[\text{unroll } \bullet]$ with $S'_1 \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B}[\nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B} / \underline{Y}], j}^{\log} S'_2$, so by anti-reduction it is sufficient to show

$$S'_1[M[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S'_2[M'[\gamma_2]])$$

which follows by $M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M'$ and downward-closure.

$$(24) \frac{\Gamma \models M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M' \in \nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B}}{\Gamma \models \text{unroll } M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \text{unroll } M' \in \underline{B}[\nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B} / \underline{Y}]} \text{ We need to show}$$

$$S_1[\text{unroll } M] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[\text{unroll } M']),$$

which follows because $S_1[\text{unroll } \bullet] \trianglelefteq_{\nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B}, i}^{\log} S_2[\text{unroll } \bullet]$ and $M \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M'$.

□

As a direct consequence we get the reflexivity of the relation

COROLLARY 6.23 (REFLEXIVITY). *For any $\Gamma \vdash M : \underline{B}$, and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Gamma \models M \preceq_i^{\log} M \in \underline{B}$.*

so we have the following *strengthening* of the progress-and-preservation type soundness theorem: because \preceq^i only counts unrolling steps, terms that never use μ or ν types (for example) are guaranteed to terminate.

COROLLARY 6.24 (UNARY LR). *For every program $\cdot \vdash M : \underline{F2}$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $M \preceq^i \text{result}(M)$*

PROOF. By reflexivity, $\cdot \models M \preceq^i M \in \underline{F2}$ and by definition $\bullet \preceq_{F2,i}^{\log} \bullet$, so unrolling definitions we get $M \preceq^i \text{result}(M)$. \square

Using reflexivity, we prove that the indexed relation between terms and results recovers the original preorder in the limit as $i \rightarrow \omega$. We write \preceq^ω to mean the relation holds for every i , i.e., $\preceq^\omega = \bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \preceq^i$.

COROLLARY 6.25 (LIMIT LEMMA). *For any divergence preorder \preceq , $\text{result}(M) \preceq R$ iff $M \preceq^\omega R$.*

PROOF. Two cases

- (1) If $\text{result}(M) \preceq R$ then we need to show for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $M \preceq^i R$. By the unary model lemma, $M \preceq^i \text{result}(M)$, so the result follows by the module lemma 6.15.
- (2) If $M \preceq^i R$ for every i , then there are two possibilities: M is always related to R because it takes i steps, or at some point M terminates.
 - (a) If $M \Rightarrow^i M_i$ for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\text{result}(M) = \Omega$, so $\text{result}(M) \preceq R$ because \preceq is a divergence preorder.
 - (b) Otherwise there exists some $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $M \Rightarrow^i \text{result}(M)$, so it follows by the module lemma 6.15.

\square

COROLLARY 6.26 (LOGICAL IMPLIES CONTEXTUAL). *If $\Gamma \models E \preceq_\omega^{\log} E' \in \underline{B}$ then $\Gamma \models E \preceq^{ctx} E' \in \underline{B}$.*

PROOF. Let C be a closing context. By congruence, $C[M] \preceq_\omega^{\log} C[N]$, so using empty environment and stack, $C[M] \preceq^\omega \text{result}(C[N])$ and by the limit lemma, we have $\text{result}(C[M]) \preceq \text{result}(C[N])$. \square

In fact, we can prove the converse, that at least for the term case, the logical preorder is *complete* with respect to the contextual preorder, though we don't use it.

LEMMA 6.27 (CONTEXTUAL IMPLIES LOGICAL). *For any \preceq , if $\Gamma \models M \preceq^{ctx} N \in \underline{B}$, then $\Gamma \models M \preceq_\omega^{\log} N \in \underline{B}$.*

PROOF. Let $S_1 \leq_{\underline{B},i}^{\log} S_2$ and $\gamma_1 \leq_{\Gamma,i}^{\log} \gamma_2$. We need to show that

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \leq^i \text{result}(S_2[N[\gamma_2]])$$

So we need to construct a *context* that when M or N is plugged into the hole will reduce to the above.

To do this, first, we deconstruct the context $x_1 : A_1, \dots, x_n : A_n = \Gamma$. Then we define $\cdot \vdash M' : A_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow A_n \rightarrow \underline{B}$ as

$$\lambda x_1 : A_1 \dots \lambda x_n : A_n. M$$

And similarly define N' . Then clearly

$$S[M' V_1 \dots V_n] \Rightarrow^0 S[M[V_1/x_1, \dots, V_n/x_n]]$$

so in particular

$$S[M' \gamma(x_1) \dots \gamma(x_n)] \Rightarrow^0 S[M[\gamma]]$$

and similarly for N' if x_1, \dots, x_n are all of the variables in γ .

Then the proof proceeds by the following transitivity chain:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1[M[\gamma_1]] &\leq^i \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]]) && (M \leq_i^{\log} M) \\ &= \text{result}(S_2[M' \gamma_2(x_1) \dots \gamma_2(x_n)]) && (\text{reduction}) \\ &\leq \text{result}(S_2[N' \gamma_2(x_1) \dots \gamma_2(x_n)]) && (M \leq^{\text{ctx}} N) \\ &= \text{result}(S_2[N[\gamma_2]]) && (\text{reduction}) \end{aligned}$$

So $S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \leq^i \text{result}(S_2[N[\gamma_2]])$ by the module lemma 6.15. \square

This establishes that our logical relation can prove graduality, so it only remains to show that our *inequational theory* implies our logical relation. Having already validated the congruence rules and reflexivity, we validate the remaining rules of transitivity, error, substitution, and $\beta\eta$ for each type constructor. Other than the $\bigcup \sqsubseteq M$ rule, all of these hold for any divergence preorder.

For transitivity, with the unary model and limiting lemmas in hand, we can prove that all of our logical relations (open and closed) are transitive in the limit. To do this, we first prove the following kind of “quantitative” transitivity lemma, and then transitivity in the limit is a consequence.

LEMMA 6.28 (LOGICAL RELATION IS QUANTITATIVELY TRANSITIVE).

- (1) If $V_1 \leq_{A,i}^{\log} V_2$ and $V_2 \leq_{A,\omega}^{\log} V_3$, then $V_1 \leq_{A,i}^{\log} V_3$
- (2) If $S_1 \leq_{\underline{B},i}^{\log} S_2$ and $S_2 \leq_{\underline{B},\omega}^{\log} S_3$, then $S_1 \leq_{\underline{B},i}^{\log} S_3$

PROOF. Proof is by mutual lexicographic induction on the pair (i, A) or (i, \underline{B}) . All cases are straightforward uses of the inductive hypotheses except the shifts U, \underline{F} .

- (1) If $V_1 \trianglelefteq_{UB,i}^{\log} V_2$ and $V_2 \trianglelefteq_{UB,\omega}^{\log} V_3$, then we need to show that for any $S_1 \trianglelefteq_{B,j}^{\log} S_2$ with $j \leq i$,

$$S_1[\text{force } V_1] \trianglelefteq^j \text{result}(S_2[\text{force } V_3])$$

By reflexivity, we know $S_2 \trianglelefteq_{B,\omega}^{\log} S_2$, so by assumption

$$S_2[\text{force } V_2] \trianglelefteq^\omega \text{result}(S_2[\text{force } V_3])$$

which by the limiting lemma 6.25 is equivalent to

$$\text{result}(S_2[\text{force } V_2]) \trianglelefteq \text{result}(S_2[\text{force } V_3])$$

so then by the module lemma 6.15, it is sufficient to show

$$S_1[\text{force } V_1] \trianglelefteq^j \text{result}(S_2[\text{force } V_2])$$

which holds by assumption.

- (2) If $S_1 \trianglelefteq_{FA,i}^{\log} S_2$ and $S_2 \trianglelefteq_{FA,\omega}^{\log} S_3$, then we need to show that for any $V_1 \trianglelefteq_{j,A}^{\log} V_2$ with $j \leq i$ that

$$S_1[\text{ret } V_1] \trianglelefteq^j \text{result}(S_3[\text{ret } V_2])$$

First by reflexivity, we know $V_2 \trianglelefteq_{A,\omega}^{\log} V_2$, so by assumption,

$$S_2[\text{ret } V_2] \trianglelefteq^\omega \text{result}(S_3[\text{ret } V_2])$$

Which by the limit lemma 6.25 is equivalent to

$$\text{result}(S_2[\text{ret } V_2]) \trianglelefteq^\omega \text{result}(S_3[\text{ret } V_2])$$

So by the module lemma 6.15, it is sufficient to show

$$S_1[\text{ret } V_1] \trianglelefteq^j \text{result}(S_2[\text{ret } V_2])$$

which holds by assumption.

□

LEMMA 6.29 (LOGICAL RELATION IS QUANTITATIVELY TRANSITIVE (OPEN TERMS)).

- (1) If $\gamma_1 \trianglelefteq_{\Gamma,i}^{\log} \gamma_2$ and $\gamma_2 \trianglelefteq_{\Gamma,\omega}^{\log} \gamma_3$, then $\gamma_1 \trianglelefteq_{\Gamma,i}^{\log} \gamma_3$
 (2) If $\Gamma \models M_1 \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M_2 \in \underline{B}$ and $\Gamma \models M_2 \trianglelefteq_\omega^{\log} M_3 \in \underline{B}$, then $\Gamma \models M_1 \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} M_3 \in \underline{B}$.
 (3) If $\Gamma \models V_1 \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V_2 \in A$ and $\Gamma \models V_2 \trianglelefteq_\omega^{\log} V_3 \in A$, then $\Gamma \models V_1 \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} V_3 \in A$.
 (4) If $\Gamma \mid \bullet : \underline{B} \models S_1 \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} S_2 \in \underline{B}'$ and $\Gamma \mid \bullet : \underline{B} \models S_2 \trianglelefteq_\omega^{\log} S_3 \in \underline{B}'$, then $\Gamma \mid \bullet : \underline{B} \models S_1 \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} S_3 \in \underline{B}'$.

PROOF. (1) By induction on the length of the context, follows from closed value case.

- (2) Assume $\gamma_1 \trianglelefteq_{\Gamma,i}^{\log} \gamma_2$ and $S_1 \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B},i}^{\log} S_2$. We need to show

$$S_1[M_1[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[M_3[\gamma_2]])$$

by reflexivity and assumption, we know

$$S_2[M_2[\gamma_2]] \trianglelefteq^\omega \text{result}(S_2[M_3[\gamma_2]])$$

and by limit lemma 6.25, this is equivalent to

$$\text{result}(S_2[M_2[\gamma_2]]) \trianglelefteq \text{result}(S_2[M_3[\gamma_2]])$$

so by the module lemma 6.15 it is sufficient to show

$$S_1[M_1[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[M_2[\gamma_2]])$$

which follows by assumption.

- (3) Assume $\gamma_1 \trianglelefteq_{\Gamma,i}^{\log} \gamma_2$. Then $V_1[\gamma_1] \trianglelefteq_{A,i}^{\log} V_2[\gamma_2]$ and by reflexivity $\gamma_2 \trianglelefteq_{\Gamma,\omega}^{\log} \gamma_2$ so $V_2[\gamma_2] \trianglelefteq_{A,\omega}^{\log} V_3[\gamma_2]$ so the result holds by the closed case.
- (4) Stack case is essentially the same as the value case.

□

COROLLARY 6.30 (LOGICAL RELATION IS TRANSITIVE IN THE LIMIT).

- (1) If $\Gamma \models M_1 \trianglelefteq_\omega^{\log} M_2 \in \underline{B}$ and $\Gamma \models M_2 \trianglelefteq_\omega^{\log} M_3 \in \underline{B}$, then $\Gamma \models M_1 \trianglelefteq_\omega^{\log} M_3 \in \underline{B}$.
- (2) If $\Gamma \models V_1 \trianglelefteq_\omega^{\log} V_2 \in A$ and $\Gamma \models V_2 \trianglelefteq_\omega^{\log} V_3 \in A$, then $\Gamma \models V_1 \trianglelefteq_\omega^{\log} V_3 \in A$.
- (3) If $\Gamma \mid \bullet : \underline{B} \models S_1 \trianglelefteq_\omega^{\log} S_2 \in \underline{B}'$ and $\Gamma \mid \bullet : \underline{B} \models S_2 \trianglelefteq_\omega^{\log} S_3 \in \underline{B}'$, then $\Gamma \mid \bullet : \underline{B} \models S_1 \trianglelefteq_\omega^{\log} S_3 \in \underline{B}'$.

Next, we verify the β, η equivalences hold as orderings each way.

LEMMA 6.31 (β, η). For any divergence preorder, the β, η laws are valid for $\trianglelefteq_\omega^{\log}$

PROOF. The β rules for all cases except recursive types are direct from anti-reduction.

- (1) $\mu X.A - \beta$:

(a) We need to show

$$S_1[\text{unroll roll}_{\mu X.A} V[\gamma_1] \text{ to roll } x.M[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2, V[\gamma_2]/x]])$$

The left side takes 1 step to $S_1[M[\gamma_1, V[\gamma_1]/x]]$ and we know

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1, V[\gamma_1]/x]] \trianglelefteq_i^{\log} \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2, V[\gamma_2]/x]])$$

by assumption and reflexivity, so by anti-reduction we have

$$S_1[\text{unroll roll}_{\mu X.A} V[\gamma_1] \text{ to roll } x.M[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq_{i+1}^{\log} \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2, V[\gamma_2]/x]])$$

so the result follows by downward-closure.

(b) For the other direction we need to show

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1, V[\gamma_1]/x]] \leq_i^{\log} \text{result}(S_2[\text{unroll roll}_{\mu X.A} V[\gamma_2] \text{ to roll } x.M[\gamma_2]])$$

Since results are invariant under steps, this is the same as

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1, V[\gamma_1]/x]] \leq_i^{\log} \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2, V[\gamma_2/x]]])$$

which follows by reflexivity and assumptions about the stacks and substitutions.

(2) $\mu X.A - \eta$:

(a) We need to show for any $\Gamma, x : \mu X.A \vdash M : \underline{B}$, and appropriate substitutions and stacks,

$$S_1[\text{unroll roll}_{\mu X.A} \gamma_1(x) \text{ to roll } y.M[\text{roll}_{\mu X.A} y/x][\gamma_1]] \leq_i^{\log} \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

By assumption, $\gamma_1(x) \leq_{\mu X.A, i}^{\log} \gamma_2(x)$, so we know

$$\gamma_1(x) = \text{roll}_{\mu X.A} V_1$$

and

$$\gamma_2(x) = \text{roll}_{\mu X.A} V_2$$

so the left side takes a step:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1[\text{unroll roll } \gamma_1(x) \text{ to roll } y.M[\text{roll } y/x][\gamma_1]] &\Rightarrow^1 S_1[M[\text{roll } y/x][\gamma_1][V_1/y]] \\ &= S_1[M[\text{roll } V_1/x][\gamma_1]] \\ &= S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \end{aligned}$$

and by reflexivity and assumptions we know

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \leq_i^{\log} \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

so by anti-reduction we know

$$S_1[\text{unroll roll}_{\mu X.A} \gamma_1(x) \text{ to roll } y.M[\text{roll}_{\mu X.A} y/x][\gamma_1]] \leq_{i+1}^{\log} \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

so the result follows by downward closure.

(b) Similarly, to show

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \leq_i^{\log} \text{result}(S_2[\text{unroll roll}_{\mu X.A} \gamma_2(x) \text{ to roll } y.M[\text{roll}_{\mu X.A} y/x][\gamma_2]])$$

by the same reasoning as above, $\gamma_2(x) = \text{roll}_{\mu X.A} V_2$, so because result is invariant under reduction we need to show

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \leq_i^{\log} \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

which follows by assumption and reflexivity.

(3) $\nu \underline{Y}. \underline{B} - \beta$

(a) We need to show

$$S_1[\text{unroll roll}_{v\underline{Y}.B} M[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

By the operational semantics,

$$S_1[\text{unroll roll}_{v\underline{Y}.B} M[\gamma_1]] \Rightarrow^1 S_1[M[\gamma_1]]$$

and by reflexivity and assumptions

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i S_2[M[\gamma_2]]$$

so the result follows by anti-reduction and downward closure.

(b) We need to show

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[\text{unroll roll}_{v\underline{Y}.B} M[\gamma_2]])$$

By the operational semantics and invariance of result under reduction this is equivalent to

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

which follows by assumption.

(4) $v\underline{Y}.B - \eta$

(a) We need to show

$$S_1[\text{roll unroll } M[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

by assumption, $S_1 \trianglelefteq_{v\underline{Y}.B, i}^{\log} S_2$, so

$$S_1 = S'_1[\text{unroll } \bullet]$$

and therefore the left side reduces:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1[\text{roll unroll } M[\gamma_1]] &= S'_1[\text{unroll roll unroll } M[\gamma_1]] \\ &\Rightarrow^1 S'_1[\text{unroll } M[\gamma_1]] \\ &= S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \end{aligned}$$

and by assumption and reflexivity,

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

so the result holds by anti-reduction and downward-closure.

(b) Similarly, we need to show

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[\text{roll unroll } M[\gamma_2]])$$

as above, $S_1 \trianglelefteq_{v\underline{Y}.B, i}^{\log} S_2$, so we know

$$S_2 = S'_2[\text{unroll } \bullet]$$

so

$$\text{result}(S_2[\text{roll unroll } M[\gamma_2]]) = \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

and the result follows by reflexivity, anti-reduction and downward closure.

(5) 0η Let $\Gamma, x : 0 \vdash M : \underline{B}$.

(a) We need to show

$$S_1[\text{absurd } \gamma_1(x)] \leq^i \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

By assumption $\gamma_1(x) \leq_{0,i}^{\log} \gamma_2(x)$ but this is a contradiction

(b) Other direction is the same contradiction.

(6) $+\eta$. Let $\Gamma, x : A_1 + A_2 \vdash M : \underline{B}$

(a) We need to show

$$S_1[\text{case } \gamma_1(x)\{x_1.M[\text{inl } x_1/x][\gamma_1] \mid x_2.M[\text{inr } x_2/x][\gamma_1]\}] \leq^i \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

by assumption $\gamma_1(x) \leq_{A_1+A_2,i}^{\log} \gamma_2(x)$, so either it's an inl or inr . The cases are symmetric so assume $\gamma_1(x) = \text{inl } V_1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & S_1[\text{case } \gamma_1(x)\{x_1.M[\text{inl } x_1/x][\gamma_1] \mid x_2.M[\text{inr } x_2/x][\gamma_1]\}] \\ &= S_1[\text{case } (\text{inl } V_1)\{x_1.M[\text{inl } x_1/x][\gamma_1] \mid x_2.M[\text{inr } x_2/x][\gamma_1]\}] \\ &\quad \Rightarrow^0 S_1[M[\text{inl } V_1/x][\gamma_1]] \\ &\quad = S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \end{aligned}$$

and so by anti-reduction it is sufficient to show

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \leq^i S_2[M[\gamma_2]]$$

which follows by reflexivity and assumptions.

(b) Similarly, We need to show

$$\text{result}(S_1[M[\gamma_1]]) \leq^i \text{result}(S_2[\text{case } \gamma_2(x)\{x_1.M[\text{inl } x_1/x][\gamma_2] \mid x_2.M[\text{inr } x_2/x][\gamma_2]\}])$$

and by assumption $\gamma_1(x) \leq_{A_1+A_2,i}^{\log} \gamma_2(x)$, so either it's an inl or inr . The cases are symmetric so assume $\gamma_2(x) = \text{inl } V_2$. Then

$$S_2[\text{case } \gamma_2(x)\{x_1.M[\text{inl } x_1/x][\gamma_2] \mid x_2.M[\text{inr } x_2/x][\gamma_2]\}] \Rightarrow^0 S_2[M[\gamma_2]]$$

So the result holds by invariance of result under reduction, reflexivity and assumptions.

(7) 1η Let $\Gamma, x : 1 \vdash M : \underline{B}$

(a) We need to show

$$S_1[M[()/x][\gamma_1]] \leq^i \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

By assumption $\gamma_1(x) \leq_{1,i}^{\log} \gamma_2(x)$ so $\gamma_1(x) = ()$, so this is equivalent to

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \leq^i \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

which follows by reflexivity, assumption.

(b) Opposite case is similar.

(8) $\times\eta$ Let $\Gamma, x : A_1 \times A_2 \vdash M : \underline{B}$

(a) We need to show

$$S_1[\text{split } x \text{ to } (x_1, y_1).M[(x_1, y_1)/x][\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

By assumption $\gamma_1(x) \trianglelefteq_{A_1 \times A_2, i}^{\log} \gamma_2(x)$, so $\gamma_1(x) = (V_1, V_2)$, so

$$\begin{aligned} S_1[\text{split } x \text{ to } (x_1, y_1).M[(x_1, y_1)/x][\gamma_1]] &= S_1[\text{split } (V_1, V_2) \text{ to } (x_1, y_1).M[(x_1, y_1)/x][\gamma_1]] \\ &\Rightarrow^0 S_1[M[(V_1, V_2)/x][\gamma_1]] \\ &= S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \end{aligned}$$

So by anti-reduction it is sufficient to show

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

which follows by reflexivity, assumption.

(b) Opposite case is similar.

(9) $U\eta$ Let $\Gamma \vdash V : UB$

(a) We need to show that

$$\text{thunk force } V[\gamma_1] \trianglelefteq_{UB, i}^{\log} V[\gamma_2]$$

So assume $S_1 \trianglelefteq_{B, j}^{\log} S_2$ for some $j \leq i$, then we need to show

$$S_1[\text{force thunk force } V[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^j \text{result}(S_2[\text{force } V[\gamma_2]])$$

The left side takes a step:

$$S_1[\text{force thunk force } V[\gamma_1]] \Rightarrow^0 S_1[\text{force } V[\gamma_1]]$$

so by anti-reduction it is sufficient to show

$$S_1[\text{force } V[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^j \text{result}(S_2[\text{force } V[\gamma_2]])$$

which follows by assumption.

(b) Opposite case is similar.

(10) $F\eta$

(a) We need to show that given $S_1 \trianglelefteq_{FA, i}^{\log} S_2$,

$$S_1[\text{bind } x \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } x] \trianglelefteq_{FA, i}^{\log} S_2$$

So assume $V_1 \trianglelefteq_{A, j}^{\log} V_2$ for some $j \leq i$, then we need to show

$$S_1[\text{bind ret } V_1 \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } x] \trianglelefteq^j \text{result}(S_2[\text{ret } V_2])$$

The left side takes a step:

$$S_1[\text{bind ret } V_1 \leftarrow \bullet; \text{ret } x] \Rightarrow^0 S_1[\text{ret } V_1]$$

so by anti-reduction it is sufficient to show

$$S_1[\text{ret } V_1] \trianglelefteq^j \text{result}(S_2[\text{ret } V_2])$$

which follows by assumption

(b) Opposite case is similar.

(11) $\rightarrow \eta$ Let $\Gamma \vdash M : A \rightarrow \underline{B}$

(a) We need to show

$$S_1[(\lambda x : A. M[\gamma_1] x)] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

by assumption that $S_1 \trianglelefteq_{A \rightarrow \underline{B}, i}^{\log} S_2$, we know

$$S_1 = S'_1[\bullet V_1]$$

so the left side takes a step:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1[(\lambda x : A. M[\gamma_1] x)] &= S'_1[(\lambda x : A. M[\gamma_1] x) V_1] \\ &\Rightarrow^0 S'_1[M[\gamma_1] V_1] \\ &= S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \end{aligned}$$

So by anti-reduction it is sufficient to show

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

which follows by reflexivity, assumption.

(b) Opposite case is similar.

(12) $\&\eta$ Let $\Gamma \vdash M : \underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2$

(a) We need to show

$$S_1[\{\pi \mapsto \pi M[\gamma_1] \mid \pi' \mapsto \pi' M[\gamma_1]\}] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_1[M[\gamma_2]])$$

by assumption, $S_1 \trianglelefteq_{\underline{B}_1 \& \underline{B}_2, i}^{\log} S_2$ so either it starts with a π or π' so assume that $S_1 = S'_1[\pi \bullet]$ (π' case is similar). Then the left side reduces

$$\begin{aligned} S_1[\{\pi \mapsto \pi M[\gamma_1] \mid \pi' \mapsto \pi' M[\gamma_1]\}] &= S'_1[\pi \{\pi \mapsto \pi M[\gamma_1] \mid \pi' \mapsto \pi' M[\gamma_1]\}] \\ &\Rightarrow^0 S'_1[\pi M[\gamma_1]] \\ &= S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \end{aligned}$$

So by anti-reduction it is sufficient to show

$$S_1[M[\gamma_1]] \trianglelefteq^i \text{result}(S_2[M[\gamma_2]])$$

which follows by reflexivity, assumption.

(b) Opposite case is similar.

(13) $\top \eta$ Let $\Gamma \vdash M : \top$

(a) In either case, we assume we are given $S_1 \trianglelefteq_{\top, i}^{\log} S_2$, but this is a contradiction.

□

LEMMA 6.32 (SUBSTITUTION PRINCIPLES). *For any diverge-bottom preorder \trianglelefteq , the following are valid*

$$\begin{aligned}
(1) \quad & \frac{\Gamma \models V_1 \leq_i^{\log} V_2 \in A \quad \Gamma, x : A \models V'_1 \leq_V^{\log'} V_2 \in A'}{\Gamma \models V'_1[V_1/x] \leq_V^{\log'} [V_2/x] \in A'} \\
(2) \quad & \frac{\Gamma \models V_1 \leq_i^{\log} V_2 \in A \quad \Gamma, x : A \models M_1 \leq_M^{\log} M_2 \in \underline{B}}{\Gamma \models M_1[V_1/x] \leq_M^{\log} [V_2/x] \in \underline{B}}
\end{aligned}$$

PROOF. We do the term case, the value case is similar. Given $\gamma_1 \leq_{\Gamma, i}^{\log} \gamma_2$, we have $V_1[\gamma_1] \leq_{A, i}^{\log} V_2[\gamma_2]$ so

$$\gamma_1, V_1[\gamma_1]/x \leq_{\Gamma, x:A, i}^{\log} \gamma_2, V_2[\gamma_2]/x$$

and by associativity of substitution

$$M_1[V_1/x][\gamma_1] = M_1[\gamma_1, V_1[\gamma_1]/x]$$

and similarly for M_2 , so if $S_1 \leq_{B, i}^{\log} S_2$ then

$$S_1[M_1[\gamma_1, V_1[\gamma_1]/x]] \leq^i \text{result}(S_2[M_2[\gamma_2, V_2[\gamma_2]/x]])$$

□

For errors, the strictness axioms hold for any \leq , but the axiom that \mathcal{U} is a least element is specific to the definitions of \leq_{\sqsubseteq} , \sqsubseteq_{\geq}

LEMMA 6.33 (ERROR RULES). *For any divergence preorder \leq and appropriately typed S, M ,*

$$S[\mathcal{U}] \leq_{\omega}^{\log} \mathcal{U} \quad \mathcal{U} \leq_{\omega}^{\log} S[\mathcal{U}] \quad \mathcal{U} \leq_{\omega}^{\log} M \quad M \leq_{\omega}^{\log} \mathcal{U}$$

PROOF. (1) It is sufficient by the limit lemma to show $\text{result}(S[\mathcal{U}]) \leq \mathcal{U}$ which holds by reflexivity because $S[\mathcal{U}] \Rightarrow^0 \mathcal{U}$.

(2) We need to show $S[\mathcal{U}] \leq_{\sqsubseteq}^i R$ for arbitrary R , so by the limit lemma it is sufficient to show $\mathcal{U} \leq_{\sqsubseteq} R$, which is true by definition.

(3) By the limit lemma it is sufficient to show $R \leq_{\sqsupseteq} \mathcal{U}$ which is true by definition.

□

The lemmas we have proved cover all of the inequality rules of CBPV, so applying them with \leq chosen to be \leq_{\sqsubseteq} and \leq_{\sqsupseteq} gives

LEMMA 6.34 (\leq_{\sqsubseteq} AND \leq_{\sqsupseteq} ARE MODELS OF CBPV). *If $\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash E \sqsubseteq E' : \underline{B}$ then $\Gamma \mid \Delta \models E \leq_{\sqsubseteq}^{\omega} E' \in \underline{B}$ and $\Gamma \mid \Delta \models E' \leq_{\sqsupseteq}^{\omega} E \in \underline{B}$.*

Because logical implies contextual equivalence, we can conclude with the main theorem:

THEOREM 6.35 (CONTEXTUAL APPROXIMATION/EQUIVALENCE MODEL CBPV).

If $\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash E \sqsubseteq E' : T$ then $\Gamma \mid \Delta \models E \sqsubseteq^{ctx} E' \in T$; if $\Gamma \mid \Delta \vdash E \sqsupseteq E' : T$ then $\Gamma \mid \Delta \models E =^{ctx} E' \in T$.

PROOF. For the first part, from Lemma 6.34, we have $E \leq \sqsubseteq^\omega E'$ and $E' \leq \sqsupset^\omega E$. By Lemma 6.26, we then have $E \leq \sqsubseteq^{\text{ctx}} E'$ and $E' \leq \sqsupset^{\text{ctx}} E$. Finally, by Corollary 6.13, $E \sqsubseteq^{\text{ctx}} E'$ iff $E \leq \sqsubseteq^{\text{ctx}} E'$ and $E((\leq \sqsupset)^{\text{ctx}})^\circ E'$, so we have the result.

For the second part, applying the first part twice gives $E \sqsubseteq^{\text{ctx}} E'$ and $E' \sqsubseteq^{\text{ctx}} E$, and we concluded in Corollary 6.13 that this coincides with contextual equivalence. \square

7 DISCUSSION AND RELATED WORK

In this paper, we have given a logic for reasoning about gradual programs in a mixed call-by-value/call-by-name language, shown that the axioms uniquely determine almost all of the contract translation implementing runtime casts, and shown that the axiomatics is sound for contextual equivalence/approximation in an operational model.

In immediate future work, we believe it is straightforward to add inductive/coinductive types and obtain similar unique cast implementation theorems (e.g. $\langle \text{list}(A') \hookrightarrow \text{list}(A) \rangle \sqsubseteq \text{map}(\langle A' \hookrightarrow A \rangle)$). Additionally, since more efficient cast implementations such as optimized cast calculi (the lazy variant in Herman et al. [2010]) and threesome casts [Siek and Wadler 2010], are equivalent to the lazy contract semantics, they should also be models of GTT, and if so we could use GTT to reason about program transformations and optimizations in them.

Applicability of Cast Uniqueness Principles. The cast uniqueness principles given in theorem 3.15 are theorems in the formal logic of Gradual Type Theory, and so there is a question of to what languages the theorem applies. The theorem applies to any *model* of gradual type theory, such as the models we have constructed using call-by-push-value given in Sections 4, 5, 6. We conjecture that simple call-by-value and call-by-name gradual languages are also models of GTT, by extending the translation of call-by-push-value into call-by-value and call-by-name in the appendix of Levy's monograph [Levy 2003]. In order for the theorem to apply, the language must validate an appropriate version of the η principles for the types. So for example, a call-by-value language that has reference equality of functions does *not* validate even the value-restricted η law for functions, and so the case for functions does not apply. It is a well-known issue that in the presence of pointer equality of functions, the lazy semantics of function casts is not compatible with the graduality property, and our uniqueness theorem provides a different perspective on this phenomenon [Findler et al. 2004; Strickland et al. 2012; Siek et al. 2015a]. However, we note that the cases of the uniqueness theorem for each type connective are completely *modular*: they rely only on the specification of casts and the β, η principles for the particular connective, and not on the presence of any other types, even the dynamic types. So even if a call-by-value language may have reference equality functions, if it has the η principle for strict pairs, then the pair cast must be that of Theorem 3.15.

Next, we consider the applicability to non-eager languages. Analogous to call-by-value, our uniqueness principle should apply to simple *call-by-name* gradual languages, where full η equality for functions is satisfied, but η equality for booleans and strict pairs requires a “stack restriction” dual to the value restriction for call-by-value function η . We are not aware of any call-by-name gradual languages, but there is considerable work on *contracts* for non-eager languages, especially Haskell [Hinze et al. 2006; Xu et al. 2009]. However, we note that Haskell is *not* a call-by-name language in our sense for two reasons. First, Haskell uses call-by-need evaluation where results of computations are memoized. However, when only considering Haskell’s effects (error and divergence), this difference is not observable so this is not the main obstacle. The bigger difference between Haskell and call-by-name is that Haskell supports a *seq* operation that enables the programmer to force evaluation of a term to a value. This means Haskell violates the function η principle because Ω will cause divergence under *seq*, whereas $\lambda x. \Omega$ will not. This is a crucial feature of Haskell and is a major source of differences between implementations of lazy contracts, as noted in Degen et al. [2012]. We can understand this difference by using a different translation into call-by-push-value: what Levy calls the “lazy paradigm”, as opposed to call-by-name [Levy 2003]. Simply put, connectives are interpreted as in call-by-value, but with the addition of extra *thunks* UF , so for instance the lazy function type $A \rightarrow B$ is interpreted as $UFU(UFA \rightarrow FB)$ and the extra UFU here is what causes the failure of the call-by-name η principle. With this embedding and the uniqueness theorem, GTT produces a definition for lazy casts, and the definition matches the work of Xu et al. [2009] when restricting to non-dependent contracts.

Comparing Soundness Principles for Cast Semantics. Greenman and Felleisen [2018] gives a spectrum of differing syntactic type soundness theorems for different semantics of gradual typing. Our work here is complementary, showing that certain program equivalences can only be achieved by certain cast semantics.

Degen et al. [2012] give an analysis of different cast semantics for contracts in lazy languages, specifically based on Haskell, i.e., call-by-need with *seq*. They propose two properties “meaning preservation” and “completeness” that they show are incompatible and identify which contract semantics for a lazy language satisfy which of the properties. The meaning preservation property is closely related to graduality: it says that evaluating a term with a contract either produces blame or has the same observable effect as running the term without the contract. Meaning preservation rules out overly strict contract systems that force (possibly diverging) *thunks* that wouldn’t be forced in a non-contracted term. Completeness, on the other hand, requires that when a contract is attached to a value that it is *deeply* checked. The two properties are incompatible because, for instance, a pair of a diverging term and a value can’t be deeply checked without causing the entire

program to diverge. Using Levy’s embedding of the lazy paradigm into call-by-push-value their incompatibility theorem should be a consequence of our main theorem in the following sense. We showed that any contract semantics departing from the implementation in Theorem 3.15 must violate η or graduality. Their completeness property is inherently eager, and so must be different from the semantics GTT would provide, so either the restricted η or graduality fails. However, since they are defining contracts within the language, they satisfy the restricted η principle provided by the language, and so it must be graduality, and therefore meaning preservation that fails.

Axiomatic Casts. Henglein’s work on dynamic typing also uses an axiomatic semantics of casts, but axiomatizes behavior of casts at each type directly whereas we give a uniform definition of all casts and derive implementations for each type [Henglein 1994]. Because of this, the theorems proven in that paper are more closely related to our model construction in Section 4. More specifically, many of the properties of casts needed to prove Theorem 4.23 have direct analogues in Henglein’s work, such as the coherence theorems. We have not included these lemmas in the paper because they are quite similar to lemmas proven in New and Ahmed [2018]; see there for a more detailed comparison, and the extended version of this paper for full proof details [New et al. 2018]. Finally, we note that our assumption of compositionality, i.e., that all casts can be decomposed into an upcast followed by a downcast, is based on Henglein’s analysis, where it was proven to hold in his coercion calculus.

Gradual Typing Frameworks. In this work we have applied a method of “gradualizing” axiomatic type theories by adding in dynamism orderings and adding dynamic types, casts and errors by axioms related to the dynamism orderings. This is similar in spirit to two recent frameworks for designing gradual languages: Abstracting Gradual Typing (AGT) [Garcia et al. 2016] and the Gradualizer [Cimini and Siek 2016, 2017]. All of these approaches start with a typed language and construct a related gradual language. A major difference between our approach and those is that our work is based on axiomatic semantics and so we take into account the equality principles of the typed language, whereas Gradualizer is based on the typing and operational semantics and AGT is based on the type safety proof of the typed language. Furthermore, our approach produces not just a single language, but also an axiomatization of the structure of gradual typing and so we can prove results about many languages by proving theorems in GTT. The downside to this is that our approach doesn’t directly provide an operational semantics for the gradual language, whereas for AGT this is a semi-mechanical process and for Gradualizer, completely automated. Finally, we note that AGT produces the “eager” semantics for function types, and it is not clear how to modify the AGT methodology to reproduce the lazy semantics that GTT provides. More generally, both AGT and

the Gradualizer are known to produce violations of parametricity when applied to polymorphic languages, with the explanation being that the parametricity property is in no way encoded in the input to the systems: the operational semantics and the type safety proof. In future work, we plan to apply our axiomatic approach to gradualizing polymorphism and state by starting with the rich *relational logics and models* of program equivalence for these features [Plotkin and Abadi 1993; Dunphy 2002; Matthews and Ahmed 2008; Neis et al. 2009; Ahmed et al. 2009], which may lend insight into existing proposals [Siek et al. 2015b; Ahmed et al. 2017; Igarashi et al. 2017a; Siek and Taha 2006]— for example, whether the “monotonic” [Siek et al. 2015b] and “proxied” [Siek and Taha 2006] semantics of references support relational reasoning principles of local state.

Blame. We do not give a treatment of runtime blame reporting, but we argue that the observation that upcasts are thunkable and downcasts are linear is directly related to blame soundness [Tobin-Hochstadt and Felleisen 2006; Wadler and Findler 2009] in that if an upcast were *not* thunkable, it should raise positive blame and if a downcast were *not* linear, it should raise negative blame. First, consider a potentially effectful stack upcast of the form $\langle \underline{FA'} \rightsquigarrow \underline{FA} \rangle$. If it is not thunkable, then in our logical relation this would mean there is a value $V : A$ such that $\langle \underline{FA'} \rightsquigarrow \underline{FA} \rangle(\text{ret } V)$ performs some effect. Since the only observable effects for casts are dynamic type errors, $\langle \underline{FA'} \rightsquigarrow \underline{FA} \rangle(\text{ret } V) \mapsto \mathbb{U}$, and we must decide whether the positive party or negative party is at fault. However, since this is call-by-value evaluation, this error happens unconditionally on the continuation, so the continuation never had a chance to behave in such a way as to prevent blame, and so we must blame the positive party. Dually, consider a value downcast of the form $\langle \underline{UB} \leftarrow \underline{UB'} \rangle$. If it is not linear, that would mean it forces its $\underline{UB'}$ input either never or more than once. Since downcasts should refine their inputs, it is not possible for the downcast to use the argument twice, since e.g. printing twice does not refine printing once. So if the cast is not linear, that means it fails without ever forcing its input, in which case it knows nothing about the positive party and so must blame the negative party. In future work, we plan to investigate extensions of GTT with more than one \mathbb{U} with different blame labels, and an axiomatic account of a blame-aware observational equivalence.

Denotational and Category-theoretic Models. We have presented certain concrete models of GTT using ordered CBPV with errors, in order to efficiently arrive at a concrete operational interpretation. It may be of interest to develop a more general notion of model of GTT for which we can prove soundness and completeness theorems, as in New and Licata [2018]. A model would be a strong adjunction between double categories where one of the double categories has all “companions” and the other has all “conjoiners”, corresponding to our upcasts and downcasts. Then the contract translation should be a construction that takes a strong adjunction

between 2-categories and makes a strong adjunction between double categories where the ep pairs are “Kleisli” ep pairs: the upcast is has a right adjoint, but only in the Kleisli category and vice-versa the downcast has a left adjoint in the co-Kleisli category.

Furthermore, the ordered CBPV with errors should also have a sound and complete notion of model, and so our contract translation should have a semantic analogue as well.

Gradual Session Types. Gradual session types [Igarashi et al. 2017b] share some similarities to GTT, in that there are two sorts of types (values and sessions) with a dynamic value type and a dynamic session type. However, their language is not *polarized* in the same way as CBPV, so there is not likely an analogue between our upcasts always being between value types and downcasts always being between computation types. Instead, we might reconstruct this in a polarized session type language [Pfenning and Griffith 2015]. The two dynamic types would then be the “universal sender” and “universal receiver” session types.

Dynamically Typed Call-by-push-value. Our interpretation of the dynamic types in CBPV suggests a design for a Scheme-like language with a value and computation distinction. This may be of interest for designing an extension of Typed Racket that efficiently supports CBN or a Scheme-like language with codata types. While the definition of the dynamic computation type by a lazy product may look strange, we argue that it is no stranger than the use of its dual, the sum type, in the definition of the dynamic value type. That is, in a truly dynamically typed language, we would not think of the dynamic type as being built out of some sum type construction, but rather that it is the *union* of all of the ground value types, and the union happens to be a *disjoint* union and so we can model it as a sum type. In the dual, we don’t think of the computation dynamic type as a *product*, but instead as the *intersection* of the ground computation types. Thinking of the type as unfolding:

$$\underline{\dot{c}} = \underline{F}\underline{\dot{c}} \wedge (? \rightarrow \underline{F}?) \wedge (? \rightarrow ? \rightarrow \underline{F}?) \wedge \dots$$

This says that a dynamically typed computation is one that can be invoked with any finite number of arguments on the stack, a fairly accurate model of implementations of Scheme that pass multiple arguments on the stack.

Dependent Contract Checking. We also plan to explore using GTT’s specification of casts in a dependently typed setting, building on work using Galois connections for casts between dependent types [Dagand et al. 2018], and work on effectful dependent types based a CBPV-like judgement structure [Ahman et al. 2016].

Acknowledgments. We thank Ron Garcia, Kenji Maillard and Gabriel Scherer for helpful discussions about this work. We thank the anonymous reviewers for helpful feedback on this article. This material is based on research sponsored

by the National Science Foundation under grant CCF-1453796 and the United States Air Force Research Laboratory under agreement number FA9550-15-1-0053 and FA9550-16-1-0292. The views and conclusions contained herein are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies or endorsements, either expressed or implied, of the United States Air Force Research Laboratory, the U.S. Government, or Carnegie Mellon University.

REFERENCES

- Danel Ahman, Neil Ghani, and Gordon D. Plotkin. 2016. Dependent Types and Fibred Computational Effects. In *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures*. 36–54.
- Amal Ahmed. 2006. Step-Indexed Syntactic Logical Relations for Recursive and Quantified Types. In *European Symposium on Programming (ESOP)*. 69–83.
- Amal Ahmed, Derek Dreyer, and Andreas Rossberg. 2009. State-Dependent Representation Independence. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*, Savannah, Georgia.
- Amal Ahmed, Dustin Jamner, Jeremy G. Siek, and Philip Wadler. 2017. Theorems for Free for Free: Parametricity, With and Without Types. In *International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP)*, Oxford, United Kingdom.
- Jean-Marc Andreoli. 1992. Logic programming with focusing proofs in linear logic. *Journal of Logic and Computation* 2, 3 (1992), 297–347.
- Andrej Bauer and Matija Pretnar. 2013. An Effect System for Algebraic Effects and Handlers. In *Algebra and Coalgebra in Computer Science*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1–16.
- Matteo Cimini and Jeremy G. Siek. 2016. The Gradualizer: A Methodology and Algorithm for Generating Gradual Type Systems. In *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL '16)*.
- Matteo Cimini and Jeremy G. Siek. 2017. Automatically Generating the Dynamic Semantics of Gradually Typed Languages. In *Proceedings of the 44th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL 2017)*. 789–803.
- Pierre-Évariste Dagand, Nicolas Tabareau, and Éric Tanter. 2018. Foundations of dependent interoperability. *Journal of Functional Programming* 28 (2018), e9. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956796818000011>
- Markus Degen, Peter Thiemann, and Stefan Wehr. 2012. The interaction of contracts and laziness. *Higher-Order and Symbolic Computation* 25 (2012), 85–125.
- Brian Patrick Dunphy. 2002. *Parametricity As a Notion of Uniformity in Reflexive Graphs*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Champaign, IL, USA. Advisor(s) Reddy, Uday.
- Robert Bruce Findler and Matthias Felleisen. 2002. Contracts for higher-order functions. In *International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP)*. 48–59.
- Robert Bruce Findler, Matthew Flatt, and Matthias Felleisen. 2004. Semantic Casts: Contracts and Structural Subtyping in a Nominal World. In *European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming (ECOOP)*.
- Carsten Führmann. 1999. Direct models of the computational lambda-calculus. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* 20 (1999), 245–292.
- Ronald Garcia, Alison M. Clark, and Éric Tanter. 2016. Abstracting Gradual Typing. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*.
- Jean-Yves Girard. 2001. Locus Solum: From the rules of logic to the logic of rules. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* 11, 3 (2001), 301–506.

- Michael Greenberg. 2015. Space-Efficient Manifest Contracts. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*. 181–194.
- Michael Greenberg, Benjamin C. Pierce, and Stephanie Weirich. 2010. Contracts Made Manifest (*POPL '10*).
- Ben Greenman and Matthias Felleisen. 2018. A Spectrum of Type Soundness and Performance. In *International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP), St. Louis, Missouri*.
- Fritz Henglein. 1994. Dynamic Typing: Syntax and Proof Theory. 22, 3 (1994), 197–230.
- David Herman, Aaron Tomb, and Cormac Flanagan. 2010. Space-efficient gradual typing. *Higher-Order and Symbolic Computation* (2010).
- Ralf Hinze, Johan Jeuring, and Andres Löb. 2006. Typed Contracts for Functional Programming. In *International Symposium on Functional and Logic Programming (FLOPS)*.
- Atsushi Igarashi, Peter Thiemann, Vasco T. Vasconcelos, and Philip Wadler. 2017b. Gradual Session Types. *Proceedings of ACM Programming Languages* 1, ICFP, Article 38 (Aug. 2017), 28 pages.
- Yuu Igarashi, Taro Sekiyama, and Atsushi Igarashi. 2017a. On Polymorphic Gradual Typing. In *International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP), Oxford, United Kingdom*.
- Paul Blain Levy. 2003. *Call-By-Push-Value: A Functional/Imperative Synthesis*. Springer.
- Paul Blain Levy. 2017. Contextual Isomorphisms. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*.
- Sam Lindley, Conor McBride, and Craig McLaughlin. 2017. Do Be Do Be Do. In *Proceedings of the 44th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL 2017)*. ACM, 500–514.
- Jacob Matthews and Amal Ahmed. 2008. Parametric polymorphism through run-time sealing, or, Theorems for low, low prices!. In *European Symposium on Programming (ESOP)*.
- Eugenio Moggi. 1991. Notions of computation and monads. *Inform. And Computation* 93, 1 (1991).
- Guillaume Munch-Maccagnoni. 2014. Models of a Non-associative Composition. In *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures*. 396–410.
- Hiroshi Nakano. [n. d.]. A modality for recursion. In *Logic in Computer Science, 2000. Proceedings. 15th Annual IEEE Symposium on*.
- Georg Neis, Derek Dreyer, and Andreas Rossberg. 2009. Non-Parametric Parametricity. In *International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP)*. 135–148.
- Max S. New and Amal Ahmed. 2018. Graduality from Embedding-Projection Pairs. In *International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP), St. Louis, Missouri*.
- Max S. New and Daniel R. Licata. 2018. Call-by-name Gradual Type Theory. *FSCD* (2018).
- Max S. New, Daniel R. Licata, and Amal Ahmed. 2018. Gradual Type Theory (Extend Version). (2018). arxiv:.
- Frank Pfenning and Dennis Griffith. 2015. Polarized Substructural Session Types (invited talk). In *International Conference on Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures (FoSSaCS)*.
- Gordon D. Plotkin and Martín Abadi. 1993. A Logic for Parametric Polymorphism. In *Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications, International Conference on Typed Lambda Calculi and Applications, TLCA '93, Utrecht, The Netherlands, March 16-18, 1993, Proceedings*. 361–375.
- Jeremy Siek, Ronald Garcia, and Walid Taha. 2009. Exploring the Design Space of Higher-Order Casts. In *European Symposium on Programming (ESOP)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 17–31.
- Jeremy Siek and Sam Tobin-Hochstadt. 2016. The recursive union of some gradual types. *A List of Successes That Can Change the World: Essays Dedicated to Philip Wadler on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday (Springer LNCS)* volume 9600 (2016).

- Jeremy Siek, Micahel Vitousek, Matteo Cimini, and John Tang Boyland. 2015a. Refined Criteria for Gradual Typing. In *1st Summit on Advances in Programming Languages (SNAPL 2015)*.
- Jeremy G. Siek and Walid Taha. 2006. Gradual Typing for Functional Languages. In *Scheme and Functional Programming Workshop (Scheme)*. 81–92.
- Jeremy G. Siek, Michael M. Vitousek, Matteo Cimini, Sam Tobin-Hochstadt, and Ronald Garcia. 2015b. Monotonic References for Efficient Gradual Typing. In *Proceedings of the 24th European Symposium on Programming on Programming Languages and Systems - Volume 9032*.
- Jeremy G. Siek and Philip Wadler. 2010. Threesomes, with and Without Blame. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*. ACM, 365–376.
- T. Stephen Strickland, Sam Tobin-Hochstadt, Robert Bruce Findler, and Matthew Flatt. 2012. Chap-erones and Impersonators: Run-time Support for Reasonable Interposition (*ACM Symposium on Object Oriented Programming: Systems, Languages, and Applications (OOPSLA)*).
- Sam Tobin-Hochstadt and Matthias Felleisen. 2006. Interlanguage Migration: From Scripts to Programs. In *Dynamic Languages Symposium (DLS)*. 964–974.
- Michael M. Vitousek, Cameron Swords, and Jeremy G. Siek. 2017. Big Types in Little Runtime: Open-world Soundness and Collaborative Blame for Gradual Type Systems (*POPL 2017*).
- Philip Wadler and Robert Bruce Findler. 2009. Well-typed programs can’t be blamed. In *European Symposium on Programming (ESOP)*. 1–16.
- Dana N. Xu, Simon Peyton Jones, and Koen Claessen. 2009. Static Contract Checking for Haskell (*ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*, Savannah, Georgia).
- Noam Zeilberger. 2009. *The Logical Basis of Evaluation Order and Pattern-Matching*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Carnegie Mellon University.