Call-by-Name Gradual Type Theory

Max S. New[1]

Northeastern University, Boston, USA
maxnew@ccs.neu.edu

Daniel R. Licata[2]

Wesleyan University, Middletown, USA
dlicata@wesleyan.edu

──────── **Abstract** ────────

We present *gradual type theory*, a logic and type theory for call-by-name gradual typing. We define the central constructions of gradual typing (the dynamic type, type casts and type error) in a novel way, by universal properties relative to new judgments for *gradual type and term dynamism*. These dynamism judgements build on prior work in blame calculi and on the "gradual guarantee" theorem of gradual typing. Combined with the ordinary extensionality (η) principles that type theory provides, we show that most of the standard operational behavior of casts is *uniquely determined* by the gradual guarantee. This provides a semantic justification for the definitions of casts, and shows that non-standard definitions of casts must violate these principles. Our type theory is the internal language of a certain class of preorder categories called *equipments*. We give a general construction of an equipment interpreting gradual type theory from a 2-category representing non-gradual types and programs, which is a semantic analogue of the interpretation of gradual typing using contracts, and use it to build some concrete domain-theoretic models of gradual typing.

1   Introduction

Gradually typed languages allow for static and dynamic programming styles within the same language. They are designed with twin goals of allowing easy interoperability between static

---

The official version will be available from July 9, 2018 at:
http://www.dagstuhl.de/dagpub/978-3-95977-077-4

and dynamic portions of a codebase and facilitating a smooth transition from dynamic to static typing. This allows for the introduction of new typing features to legacy languages and codebases without the enormous manual effort currently necessary to migrate code from a dynamically typed language to a fully statically typed language. Gradual typing allows exploratory programming and prototyping to be done in a forgiving, dynamically typed style, while later that code can be typed to ease readability and refactoring. Due to this appeal, there has been a great deal of research on extending gradual typing [29, 25] to numerous language features such as parametric polymorphism [1, 12], effect tracking [2], typestate [33], session types [11], and refinement types [14]. Almost all work on gradual typing is based solely on operational semantics, and recent work such as [24] has codified some of the central design principles of gradual typing in an operational setting. In this paper, we are interested in complementing this operational work with a type-theoretic and category-theoretic analysis of these design principles. We believe this will improve our understanding of gradually typed languages, particularly with respect to principles for reasoning about program equivalence, and assist in designing and evaluating new gradually typed languages.

One of the central design principles for gradual typing is *gradual type soundness*. At its most general, this should mean that the types of the gradually typed language provide the same type-based reasoning that one could reasonably expect from a similar statically typed language, i.e. one with effects. While this has previously been defined using operational semantics and a notion of *blame* [31], the idea of soundness we consider here is that the types should provide the same extensionality (η) principles as in a statically typed language. This way, programmers can reason about the "typed" parts of gradual programs in the same way as in a fully static language. This definition fits nicely with a category-theoretic perspective, because the β and η principles correspond to definitions of connectives by a *universal property*. The second design principle is the *gradual guarantee* [24], which we will refer to as *graduality* (by analogy with parametricity). Informally, graduality of a language means that syntactic changes from dynamic to static typing (or vice-versa) should result in simple, predictable changes to the semantics of a term. More specifically, if a portion of a program is made "more static"/"less dynamic" then the new program should either have the same behavior or result in a runtime type error. Other observable behavior such as values produced, I/O actions performed or termination should not be changed.

In this paper, we codify these two principles of soundness and graduality *directly* into a logical syntax we dub (call-by-name) *Gradual Type Theory* (Section 2). For graduality, we develop a logic of *type and term dynamism* that can be used to reason about the relationship between "more dynamic" and "less dynamic" versions of a program, and to give novel specifications/universal properties for the dynamic type, type errors, and runtime type casts of a gradually typed language. These universal properties extend the judgmental approach to type theory (see [16, 21]) to the key features of gradual typing. For soundness, we assert β and η principles as axioms of term dynamism, so it can also be used to reason about programs' behavior. Furthermore, using the η principles for types, we show that most of the operational rules of runtime casts of existing (call-by-name) gradually typed languages are *uniquely determined* by these constraints of soundness and graduality (Section 3). For example, uniqueness implies that any enforcement scheme in a specific gradually typed language that is *not* equivalent to the standard "wrapping" ones *must* violate either soundness or graduality. We have chosen call-by-name because it is a simple setting with the necessary η principles (for negative types) to illustrate our technique; we leave a call-by-value extension to future work.

We give a sound and complete category theoretic semantics for gradual type theory in

terms of certain *preorder categories* (double categories where one direction is thin) (Section 4). We show that the contract interpretation of gradual typing [30] can be understood as a tool for constructing models (Section 5): starting from some existing language/category C, we first implement casts as suitable pairs of functions/morphisms from C, and then equip every type with canonical casts to the dynamic type. We apply this to construct some concrete models in domains (Section 6). Conceptually, gradual type theory is analogous to Moggi's *monadic metalanguage* [18]: it clarifies general principles present in many different programming languages; it is the internal language of a quite general class of category-theoretic structures; and, for a specific language, a number of useful results can be proved all at once by showing that a logical relation over it is a model of the type theory.

A logic of dynamism and casts   Before proceeding to the technical details, we explain at a high level how our type theory accounts for two key features of gradual typing: graduality and casts. The "gradual guarantee" as defined in [24] applies to a surface language where runtime type casts are implicitly inserted based on type annotations, but we will focus here on an analysis of fully elaborated languages, where explicit casts have already been inserted (so our work does not yet address gradual type checking). The gradual guarantee as defined in [24] makes use of a *syntactically less dynamic* ordering on types: the dynamic type (universal domain) ? is the most dynamic, and A is less dynamic than B if B has the same structure as A but some sub-terms are replaced with ? (for example, $A \to (B \times C)$ is less dynamic than $? \to (B \times ?)$, $? \to ?$ and ?). Intuitively, a less dynamic type constrains the behavior of the program more, but consequently gives stronger reasoning principles. This notion is extended to closed well-typed *terms* $t : A$ and $t' : A'$ with A less dynamic than A': t is *syntactically less dynamic* than t' if t is obtained from t' by replacing the input and output type of each type cast with a less (or equally) dynamic type (in [24] this was called "precision"). For example, if $add1 : ? \to \mathbb{N}$ and true $: ?$, then $add1((? \Leftarrow \mathbb{N})(\mathbb{N} \Leftarrow ?)$true$)$ (cast true from dynamic to $\mathbb{N}$ and back, to assert it is a number) is syntactically less dynamic than $add1((? \Leftarrow ?)(? \Leftarrow ?)$true$)$ (where both casts are the identity). Then the gradual guarantee [24] says that if t is syntactically less dynamic than t', then t is *semantically less dynamic* than t': either t evaluates to a type error (in which case t' may do anything) or t, t' have the same first-order behavior (both diverge or both terminate with t producing a less dynamic value). In the above example, the less dynamic term always errors (because true fails the runtime $\mathbb{N}$ check), while the more dynamic term only errors if $add1$ uses its argument as a number. In contrast, a program that returns a different value than $add1$(true) does will not be semantically less dynamic than it.

The approach we take in this paper is to give a *syntactic logic* for the *semantic* notion of one term being less dynamic than another, with $\mho$ (type error) the least element, and all term constructors monotone. We call this the *term dynamism relation* $t \sqsubseteq t'$, and it includes not only syntactic changes in type casts, as above, but also equational laws like identity and composition for casts, and $\beta\eta$ rules—so $t \sqsubseteq t'$ intuitively means that t type-errors more than (or as much as) t', but is otherwise equal according to these equational laws. A programming language that is a model of our type theory will therefore be equipped with a semantic $t[\![\sqsubseteq]\!]t'$ relation validating these rules, so $t[\![\sqsubseteq]\!]t'$ if t type-errors more than t' up to these equational and monotonicity laws. In particular, making type cast annotations less dynamic will result in related programs, and if $[\![\sqsubseteq]\!]$ is adequate (doesn't equate operationally distinguishable terms), then this implies the gradual guarantee [24]. Therefore, we say a model "satisfies graduality" in the same sense that a language satisfies parametricity.

Next, we discuss the relationship between term dynamism and casts/contracts, one of the most novel parts of our theory. Explicit casts in a gradually typed language are typically

presented by the syntactic form $(B \Leftarrow A)t$, and their semantics is either defined by various operational reductions that inspect the structure of A and B, or by "contract" translations, which compile a language with casts to another language, where the casts are implemented as ordinary functions. In both cases, the behavior of casts is defined by inspection on types and part of the language definition, with little justification beyond intuition and precedent.

In gradual type theory, on the other hand, the behavior of casts is *not* defined by inspection of types. Rather, we use the new type and term dynamism judgments, which are defined *prior to* casts, to give a few simple and uniform rules specifying casts in all types via a universal property (optimal implementation of a specification). Our methodology requires isolating two special subclasses of casts, upcasts and downcasts. An upcast goes from a "more static" to a "more dynamic" type— for instance $(? \Leftarrow (A \to B))$ is an upcast from a function type up to the dynamic type—whereas a downcast is the opposite, casting to the more static type. We represent the relationship "A is less dynamic than B" by a *type dynamism* judgment $A \sqsubseteq B$ (which corresponds to the "naïve subtyping" of [31]). In gradual type theory, the upcast $\langle B \hookleftarrow A \rangle$ from A to B and the downcast $\langle A \leftarrow B \rangle$ from B to A can be formed whenever $A \sqsubseteq B$. This leaves out certain casts like $(? \times \mathbb{N}) \Leftarrow (\mathbb{N} \times ?)$ where neither type is more dynamic than the other. However, as first recognized in [10], these casts are macro-expressible [6] as a composite of an upcast to the dynamic type and then a downcast from it (define $(B \Leftarrow A)t$ as the composite $\langle B \leftarrow ? \rangle \langle ? \hookleftarrow A \rangle t$).

A key insight is that we can give upcasts and downcasts dual specifications using term dynamism, which say how the casts relate programs to type dynamism. If $A \sqsubseteq B$, then for any term $t : A$, the upcast $\langle B \hookleftarrow A \rangle t : B$ is the *least* dynamic term of type B that is more dynamic than t. In order-theoretic terms, $\langle B \hookleftarrow A \rangle t : B$ is the $\sqsubseteq$-meet of all terms $u : B$ with $t \sqsubseteq u$. Downcasts have a dual interpretation as a $\sqsubseteq$-join. Intuitively, this property means upcast $\langle B \hookleftarrow A \rangle t$ behaves as much as possible like t itself, while supporting the additional interface provided by expanding the type from A to B.

This simple definition has powerful consequences that we explore in Section 3, because it characterizes the upcasts and downcasts up to program equivalence. We show that standard implementations of casts are the *unique* implementations that satisfy β, η and basic congruence rules. In fact, almost all of the standard operational rules of a simple call-by-name gradually typed language are term-dynamism equivalences in gradual type theory. The exception is rules that rely on disjointness of different type connectives (such as $\langle ? \to ? \leftarrow ? \rangle \langle ? \hookleftarrow ? \times ? \rangle t \mapsto \mho$), which are independent, and can be added as axioms.

2   Gradual Type Theory

In this section, we present the rules of gradual type theory (GTT). Gradual type theory presents the types, connectives and casts of gradual typing in a modular, type-theoretic way: the dynamic type and casts are defined by rules using the *judgmental structure* of the type theory, which extends the usual judgmental structure of call-by-name typed lambda calculus with a syntax for type and term dynamism. Since the judgmental structure is as important as these types, we present a bare *preorder type theory* (PTT) with no types first. Then we can modularly define what it means for this theory to have a dynamic type, casts, functions and products, and gradual type theory is preorder type theory with all of these.

Preorder Type Theory   Preorder type theory (PTT) has 6 judgments: types, contexts, type dynamism, dynamism contexts, terms and term dynamism. Their presuppositions (one is only allowed to make a judgment when these conditions hold) are presented in Figure 1, where A type and Γ ctx have no conditions. The types, contexts and terms (Figure 2) are

$$\frac{A\,\text{type} \qquad A'\,\text{type}}{A \sqsubseteq A'} \qquad \frac{\Gamma\,\text{ctx} \qquad \Gamma'\,\text{ctx}}{\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma'} \qquad \frac{\Gamma\,\text{ctx} \qquad A\,\text{type}}{\Gamma \vdash t : A} \qquad \frac{\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma' \qquad \Gamma \vdash t : A \\ A \sqsubseteq A' \qquad \Gamma' \vdash t' : A'}{\Phi \vdash t \sqsubseteq t' : A \sqsubseteq A'}$$

Figure 1 Judgment Presuppositions of Preorder Type Theory

$$\frac{X\,\text{base type}}{X\,\text{type}} \qquad \frac{}{\cdot\,\text{ctx}} \qquad \frac{\Gamma\,\text{ctx} \qquad A\,\text{type} \qquad x \notin \text{dom}(\Gamma)}{\Gamma, x : A\,\text{ctx}} \qquad \frac{}{\Gamma, x : A, \Gamma' \vdash x : A}$$

Figure 2 Preorder Type Theory: Type and Term Structure

structured as a standard call-by-name type theory. Terms are treated as intrinsically typed with respect to a context and an output type, contexts are ordered lists (this is important for our definition of dynamism context below). For bare preorder type theory, the only types are base types, and the only terms are variables and applications of uninterpreted function symbols (whose rule we omit). In the extended version [20], we give a precise definition of a *signature* specifying valid base types, function symbols, and type and term dynamism axioms. A substitution $\gamma : \Gamma' \vdash \Gamma$ is defined as usual as giving, for every typed variable in the output context $x : A \in \Gamma$, a term of that type relative to the input context $\Gamma' \vdash \gamma(x) : A$. Our term language supports a notion of substitution where if $\gamma : \Gamma' \vdash \Gamma$ and $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ then $\Gamma' \vdash t[\gamma] : A$.

Next, we discuss the new judgments of type dynamism, dynamism contexts, and term dynamism. A type dynamism judgment (Figure 3) $A \sqsubseteq B$ relates two well-formed types, and is read as "A is less dynamic than B". In preorder type theory, the only rules are reflexivity and transitivity, making type dynamism a preorder, and axioms from a signature (omitted).

The remaining rules in Figure 3 define *type dynamism contexts* Φ, which are used in the definition of term dynamism. While terms are indexed by a type and a typing context, term dynamism judgments $\Phi \vdash t \sqsubseteq t' : A \sqsubseteq A'$ are indexed by two terms $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ and $\Gamma' \vdash t' : A'$, such that $A \sqsubseteq A'$ (A is less dynamic than A') and Γ is less dynamic than Γ'. Thus, we require a judgment $\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma'$, which lifts type dynamism to contexts pointwise (for any $x : A \in \Gamma$, the corresponding $x' : A' \in \Gamma'$ satisfies $A \sqsubseteq A'$). This uses the structure of Γ and Γ' as ordered lists: a dynamism context $\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma'$ implies that Γ and Γ' have the same length and associates variables based on their order in the context, so that Φ is uniquely determined by Γ and Γ'; this is sufficient because of an admissible exchange rule for terms. We notate dynamism contexts to evoke a logical relations interpretation of term dynamism: under the conditions that $x_1 \sqsubseteq x_1' : A_1 \sqsubseteq A_1', \dots$ then we have that $t \sqsubseteq t' : B \sqsubseteq B'$.

The term dynamism judgment admits constructions (Figure 4) corresponding to both the structural rules of terms and the preorder structure of type dynamism, beginning from arbitrary term dynamism axioms (see the extended version [20] for a formal definition). First, there is a rule (TMPREC-VAR) that relates variables. Next there is a *compositionality* rule

$$\frac{}{A \sqsubseteq A} \qquad \frac{A \sqsubseteq B \qquad B \sqsubseteq C}{A \sqsubseteq C} \qquad \frac{}{\cdot : \cdot \sqsubseteq \cdot} \qquad \frac{\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma' \qquad A \sqsubseteq A'}{(\Phi, x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A') : \Gamma, x : A \sqsubseteq \Gamma', x' : A'}$$

Figure 3 Type and Context Dynamism

$$\frac{x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A' \in \Phi}{\Phi \vdash x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A'} \ \textsc{TmPrec-Var}$$

$$\frac{\Phi \vdash t \sqsubseteq t' : A \sqsubseteq A' \qquad \Psi \vdash \gamma \sqsubseteq \gamma' : \Phi}{\Psi \vdash t[\gamma] \sqsubseteq t'[\gamma'] : A \sqsubseteq A'} \ \textsc{TmPrec-Comp}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \qquad \Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma}{\Phi \vdash t \sqsubseteq t : A \sqsubseteq A} \ \textsc{TmPrec-Refl} \qquad \frac{\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma' \vdash t \sqsubseteq t' : A \sqsubseteq A' \qquad \Phi' : \Gamma' \sqsubseteq \Gamma'' \vdash t' \sqsubseteq t'' : A' \sqsubseteq A''}{\Psi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma'' \vdash t \sqsubseteq t'' : A \sqsubseteq A''} \ \textsc{TmPrec-Trans}$$

■ **Figure 4** Primitive Rules of Term Dynamism

(TmPrec-Comp) that allows us to prove dynamism judgments by breaking terms down into components. We elide the definition of *substitution dynamism* $\Phi \vdash \gamma \sqsubseteq \gamma' : \Psi$, which is pointwise term dynamism. Last, we add an appropriate form of reflexivity (TmPrec-Refl) and transitivity (TmPrec-Trans) as rules, whose well-formedness depends on the reflexivity and transitivity of type dynamism. While the reflexivity rule is intuitive, the transitivity rule is more complex. Consider an example where $A \sqsubseteq A' \sqsubseteq A''$ and $B \sqsubseteq B' \sqsubseteq B''$:

$$\frac{x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A' \vdash t \sqsubseteq t' : B \sqsubseteq B' \qquad x' \sqsubseteq x'' : A' \sqsubseteq A'' \vdash t' \sqsubseteq t'' : B' \sqsubseteq B''}{x \sqsubseteq x'' : A \sqsubseteq A'' \vdash t \sqsubseteq t'' : B \sqsubseteq B''}$$

In a logical relations interpretation of term dynamism, we would have relations $\sqsubseteq_{A,A'}$, $\sqsubseteq_{A',A''}$, $\sqsubseteq_{A,A''}$ and similarly for the B's, and the term dynamism judgment of the conclusion would be interpreted as "for any $u \sqsubseteq_{A,A''} u''$, $t[u/x] \sqsubseteq_{B,B''} t''[u''/x'']$". However, we could only instantiate the premises of the judgment if we could produce some middle u' with $u \sqsubseteq_{A,A'} u' \sqsubseteq_{A',A''} u''$. In such models, a middle u' *always* exists, because an implicit condition of the transitivity rule is that $\sqsubseteq_{A,A''}$ is the relation composite of $\sqsubseteq_{A,A'}$ and $\sqsubseteq_{A',A''}$ (the composite exists by type dynamism transitivity, and type dynamism witnesses are unique in PTT (thin in the semantics)). PTT itself does not give a term for this u', but the upcasts and downcasts in gradual type theory do (take it to be $\langle A' \hookleftarrow A \rangle u$ or $\langle A' \leftarrow A'' \rangle u''$).

Sometimes it is convenient to use the same variable name at the same type in both t and t', so we sometimes write $x : A$ in a dynamism context for $x \sqsubseteq x : A \sqsubseteq A$, and write Γ for $x_i \sqsubseteq x_i : A_i \sqsubseteq A_i$ for all $x_i : A_i$ in Γ. Similarly, we write A as the conclusion of a dynamism judgment for $A \sqsubseteq A$, so $\Gamma \vdash t \sqsubseteq t' : A$ means $\Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma \vdash t \sqsubseteq t' : A \sqsubseteq A$.

Gradual Type Theory   Preorder Type Theory gives us a simple foundation with which to build Gradual Type Theory in a modular way: we can characterize different aspects of gradual typing, such as a dynamic type, casts, and type errors separately.

We start by defining upcasts and downcasts, using type and term dynamism in Figure 5. Given that $A \sqsubseteq A'$, the upcast is a function from A to A' such that for any $t : A$, $\langle A' \hookleftarrow A \rangle t$ is the *least dynamic term of type A' that is more dynamic than t*. The UR rule can be thought of as the "introduction rule", saying $\langle A' \hookleftarrow A \rangle x$ is more dynamic than x, and then UL is the "elimination rule", saying that if some $x' : A'$ is more dynamic than $x : A$, then it is more dynamic than $\langle A' \hookleftarrow A \rangle x$ — since $\langle A' \hookleftarrow A \rangle x$ is the *least* dynamic term with this property. The rules for projections are dual, ensuring that for $x' : A'$, $\langle A \leftarrow A' \rangle x'$ is the most dynamic term of type A that is less dynamic than x'. In fact, combined with the TmPrec-Trans rule, we can show that it has a slightly more general property: $\langle A' \hookleftarrow A \rangle x$ is not just less dynamic than any term of type A' more dynamic than x, but is less dynamic than any term of type A' *or higher*, i.e. of type $A'' \sqsupseteq A'$.

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \qquad A \sqsubseteq A'}{\Gamma \vdash \langle A' \hookleftarrow A \rangle t : A'} \ \text{Upcast} \qquad\qquad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A' \qquad A \sqsubseteq A'}{\Gamma \vdash \langle A \leftarrow A' \rangle t : A} \ \text{Downcast}$$

$$\frac{A \sqsubseteq A'}{x \sqsubseteq x : A \sqsubseteq A \vdash x \sqsubseteq \langle A' \hookleftarrow A \rangle x : A \sqsubseteq A'} \ \text{UR} \qquad \frac{A \sqsubseteq A'}{x' \sqsubseteq x' : A' \sqsubseteq A' \vdash \langle A \leftarrow A' \rangle x' \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A'} \ \text{DL}$$

$$\frac{A \sqsubseteq A'}{x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A' \vdash \langle A' \hookleftarrow A \rangle x \sqsubseteq x' : A' \sqsubseteq A'} \ \text{UL} \qquad \frac{A \sqsubseteq A'}{x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A' \vdash x \sqsubseteq \langle A \leftarrow A' \rangle x' : A \sqsubseteq A} \ \text{DR}$$

$$\frac{A \sqsubseteq A'}{x : A \sqsubseteq x : A \vdash \langle A \leftarrow A' \rangle \langle A' \hookleftarrow A \rangle x \sqsubseteq x : A} \ \text{RetractAx} \qquad \frac{}{A \sqsubseteq \ ?} \qquad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \mho_A : A} \qquad \frac{\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma}{\Phi \vdash \mho_A \sqsubseteq t : A}$$

Figure 5 Upcasts, Downcasts, Dynamic Type and Type Error

As we will discuss in Section 3, these rules allow us to prove that the pair of the upcast and downcast form a *Galois connection* (adjunction), meaning $\langle A' \hookleftarrow A \rangle \langle A \leftarrow A' \rangle t \sqsubseteq t$ and $t \sqsubseteq \langle A \leftarrow A' \rangle \langle A' \hookleftarrow A \rangle t$. However in programming practice, the casts satisfy the stronger condition of being a *Galois insertion*, in which the left adjoint, the downcast, is a *retract* of the upcast, meaning $t \sqsupseteq \sqsubseteq \langle A \leftarrow A' \rangle \langle A' \hookleftarrow A \rangle t$. We can restrict to Galois insertions by adding the *retract axiom* RetractAx. Most theorems of gradual type theory do not require it, though this axiom is satisfied in all models of preorder type theory in Section 6.

The remaining rules in Figure 5 define the dynamic type and type errors, which are also given a universal property in terms of type and term dynamism. The dynamic type is defined as the most dynamic type. The type error, written as $\mho$, is defined by the fact that it is a constant at every type A that is a least element of A. By transitivity, this further implies that $\mho_A \sqsubseteq t : A \sqsubseteq A'$ for any $A' \sqsupseteq A$.

Next we illustrate how simple *negative* types can be defined in preorder type theory. Figure 6 presents the rules for function types, while the product and unit types are analogous (see the extended version [20]). The type and term constructors are the same as those in the simply typed λ-calculus. Each type constructor extends type dynamism in the standard way [10, 31, 24]: every connective is *monotone* in every argument, including the function type. Due to the covariance of the function type, type dynamism is sometimes referred to as "naïve subtyping"; see 5 for a semantic intuition. For term dynamism, we add two classes of rules. First, there are congruence rules that "extrude" the term constructor rules for the type, which are like a "congruence of contextual approximation" condition. Next, the computational rules reflect the ordinary β, η equivalences as equi-dynamism: we write $\sqsupseteq \sqsubseteq$ to mean a rule exists in each direction (which requires that the types and contexts are also equi-dynamic).

We call the accumulation of all of these connectives *gradual type theory*. In the extended version [20], we define a GTT signature, which gives axioms for base types, function symbols, type dynamism, and term dynamism, which all may make use of the dynamic type, casts, type error, function types and product types, in addition to the rules of PTT.

3 Theorems and Constructions in Gradual Type Theory

In this section, we discuss some consequences of the simple axioms of gradual type theory. We show that almost every reduction in an operational presentation of call-by-name gradual typing, and many principles used in optimization of implementations, are justified by the

$$\frac{A \sqsubseteq A' \quad B \sqsubseteq B'}{A \to B \sqsubseteq A' \to B'} \quad \frac{\Gamma, x : A \vdash t : B}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : A.t : A \to B} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A \to B \quad \Gamma \vdash u : A}{\Gamma \vdash t\,u : B}$$

$$\frac{\Phi, x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A' \vdash t \sqsubseteq t' : B \sqsubseteq B'}{\Phi \vdash \lambda x : A.t \sqsubseteq \lambda x' : A'.t' : A \to B \sqsubseteq A' \to B'} \quad \frac{\begin{array}{c}\Phi \vdash t \sqsubseteq t' : A \to B \sqsubseteq A' \to B' \\ \Phi \vdash u \sqsubseteq u' : A \sqsubseteq A' \end{array}}{\Phi \vdash t\,u \sqsubseteq t'\,u' : B \sqsubseteq B'}$$

$$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x : A.t)u \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq t[u/x] : B} \quad \frac{}{\Gamma \vdash t \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq (\lambda x : A.t\,x) : A \to B \sqsubseteq A \to B}$$

■ **Figure 6** Function Type

universal property for casts in all types, the β, η rules, and the congruence rules for connectives and terms. Thus, the combination of graduality and η principles is a strong specification for gradual typing and considerably narrows the design space. We summarize these derivations in the following theorem:

▶ **Theorem 1.** *In Gradual Type Theory, all of the following are derivable whenever the upcasts, downcasts are well-formed.*
1. *Universal Property: Casts are unique up to $\sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq$.*
2. *Identity: $\langle A \leftharpoonup A \rangle t \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq t$ and $\langle A \leftharpoondown A \rangle t \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq t$.*
3. *Composition: $\langle A'' \leftharpoonup A \rangle t \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq \langle A'' \leftharpoonup A' \rangle \langle A' \leftharpoonup A \rangle t$ and dually, $\langle A \leftharpoondown A'' \rangle t \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq \langle A \leftharpoondown A' \rangle \langle A' \leftharpoondown A'' \rangle t$.*
4. *Function Cast Reduction: $\langle A' \to B' \leftharpoonup A \to B \rangle t \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq \lambda x : A'.\langle B' \leftharpoonup B \rangle (t(\langle A \leftharpoondown A' \rangle x))$ and $\langle A \to B \leftharpoondown A' \to B' \rangle t \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq \lambda x : A'.\langle B \leftharpoondown B' \rangle (t(\langle A' \leftharpoonup A \rangle x))$.*
5. *Product Cast Reduction: $\langle A_0' \times A_1' \leftharpoonup A_0 \times A_1 \rangle t \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq (\langle A_0' \leftharpoonup A_0 \rangle \pi_0 t, \langle A_1' \leftharpoonup A_1 \rangle \pi_1 t)$ and $\langle A_0 \times A_1 \leftharpoondown A_0' \times A_1' \rangle t \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq (\langle A_0 \leftharpoondown A_0' \rangle \pi_0 t, \langle A_1 \leftharpoondown A_1' \rangle \pi_1 t)$.*
6. *Adjunction: $t \sqsubseteq \langle A \leftharpoondown A' \rangle \langle A' \leftharpoonup A \rangle t$ and $\langle A' \leftharpoonup A \rangle \langle A \leftharpoondown A' \rangle t \sqsubseteq t$, for which the retract axiom is the converse.*
7. *Cast Congruence: $x \sqsubseteq y : A \sqsubseteq B \vdash \langle A' \leftharpoonup A \rangle x \sqsubseteq \langle B' \leftharpoonup B \rangle y : A' \sqsubseteq B'$ and $x' \sqsubseteq y' : A' \sqsubseteq B' \vdash \langle A \leftharpoondown A' \rangle x' \sqsubseteq \langle B \leftharpoondown B' \rangle y' : A \sqsubseteq B$.*
8. *Errors: $\langle A' \leftharpoonup A \rangle \mho_A \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq \mho_{A'}$, and by the retract axiom $\langle A \leftharpoondown A' \rangle \mho_A \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq .\mho_{A'}$.*
9. *Equi-dynamism implies isomorphism: If $A \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq B$, then A is isomorphic to B.*

We present one example proof (most of the rest can be found in the extended version), and give some intuition for the others based on the defining properties of upcasts and downcasts as meets and joins. Part 1 says that this specification defines them *uniquely*, which we can prove by duplicating the rules for upcasts/downcasts and showing the two are $\sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq$. First, identity (2) and composition (3) are intuitive consequences that are sometimes operational reductions. Part 2 says the cast from a type to itself is the identity function and is easily justified by the specification: given $t : A$, t itself is the least dynamic element of A that is at least as dynamic as t. Part 3 says that if $A \sqsubseteq A' \sqsubseteq A''$ then casts between A, A'' factor through A'. This is important operationally, justifying the common rule $\langle A \to B \leftharpoondown ? \rangle t \mapsto \langle A \to B \leftharpoondown ? \to ? \rangle \langle ? \to ? \leftharpoondown ? \rangle t$ which says that casting to a function type first does the first order check to make sure t is a function, and then performs the checking of the function's behavior. More generally, it implies that casts from A to B commute over the dynamic type, e.g. $\langle ? \leftharpoonup B \rangle \langle B \leftharpoonup A \rangle x \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq \langle ? \leftharpoonup A \rangle x$—intuitively, if casts only perform checks, and do not change values, then a value's representation in the dynamic type should not depend on how it got there.

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{f, x \sqsubseteq x' \vdash f \sqsubseteq f : A \to B \sqsubseteq A \to B \qquad \dfrac{f, x \sqsubseteq x' \vdash x \sqsubseteq x' : A \sqsubseteq A'}{f, x \sqsubseteq x' \vdash x \sqsubseteq \langle A \twoheadleftarrow A' \rangle x' : A \sqsubseteq A}}{\dfrac{f, x \sqsubseteq x' \vdash fx \sqsubseteq f(\langle A \twoheadleftarrow A' \rangle x') : B \sqsubseteq B}{\dfrac{f, x \sqsubseteq x' \vdash fx \sqsubseteq \langle B' \twoheadleftarrow B \rangle (f(\langle A \twoheadleftarrow A' \rangle x')) : B \sqsubseteq B'}{\dfrac{\lambda x.fx \sqsubseteq \lambda x'.A'.\langle B' \twoheadleftarrow B \rangle (f(\langle A \twoheadleftarrow A' \rangle x'))}{\dfrac{f \vdash f \sqsubseteq \lambda x'.A'.\langle B' \twoheadleftarrow B \rangle (f(\langle A \twoheadleftarrow A' \rangle x')) : A \to B \sqsubseteq A' \to B'}{f : A \to B \vdash \langle A' \to B' \twoheadleftarrow A \to B \rangle f \sqsubseteq \lambda x'.A'.\langle B' \twoheadleftarrow B \rangle (f(\langle A \twoheadleftarrow A' \rangle x')) : A' \to B'}}}}} \qquad f \sqsubseteq \lambda x.fx}$$

Figure 7 Function Upcast Implementation (one case)

Next, consider the function contract reduction (4) (5 is similar). These equivalences are the standard "wrapping" implementations from [8, 7]: a function upcast uses the downcast on inputs and upcast on outputs and vice-versa for the downcast. This shows that the standard implementation is in fact the *unique* implementation to satisfy soundness and graduality. We present one of the cases for upcasts in Figure 7; the other 3 proofs are similar. First, we use the UL rule to reduce to showing the wrapping implementation is more dynamic than f itself. Then we use transitivity to η-expand f and then apply the λ congruence rule. Then we know the upcast $\langle B' \twoheadleftarrow B \rangle\cdot$ makes the term more dynamic and then apply function application congruence and use DR to show that the downcast of x' is still more dynamic than x. The other cases and the product cases follow by similar proofs.

Next, as mentioned previously, the adjunction property (6) shows that the upcast and downcast are a Galois connection with the upcast as the upper/left adjoint. This tells us that given $A \sqsubseteq A'$, the "round-trip" from A' down to A and back results in a less dynamic term and the other round-trip results in a more dynamic term. In programming practice, we expect the round trip from A to A' and back to be in fact an identity, as in the above retract axiom RETRACTAX. This theorem is the basis for our model (Section 6) where we *define* type dynamism as a pair of functions with these properties.

Next, it is important for proving the gradual guarantee [24] that all term constructors are congruences with respect to type and term dynamism. While for types like functions and products these are primitive rules, for casts congruence is derivable (7).

Error strictness (8) states that upcasts and downcasts are *strict* with respect to the type error $\mho$. The upcast preserves $\mho$ because it is a left/upper adjoint and therefore preserves colimits/joins like $\mho$. The proof that the downcast preserves $\mho$ is less modular, and uses the upcast, the retract axiom, and strictness of the upcast.

Finally, because types A and B in gradual type theory can be related both by type dynamism $A \sqsubseteq B$ and by functions $A \to B$, there are two reasonable notions of equivalence of types[3]. First, *equi-dynamism* $A \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq B$ means $A \sqsubseteq B$ and $B \sqsubseteq A$. Second, isomorphism means there exist functions $f : A \to B$ and $g : B \to A$ such that $f \circ g \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq (\lambda x : B.x)$ and $g \circ f \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq (\lambda x : A.x)$. Part 9 gives an isomorphism for any equi-dynamic types.

The converse, isomorphic types are equi-dynamic, does not hold by design, because it does not match gradual typing practice. Gradually typed languages typically have *disjointness* of connectives as operational reductions; for example, disjointness of products and functions can be expressed by an axiom $\langle (C \times D) \twoheadleftarrow ? \rangle\langle ? \twoheadleftarrow (A \to B) \rangle x \sqsubseteq \mho$ which says that casting

---

[3] Corresponding to the two notions of isomorphism in double categories

a function to a product errors. This axiom is incompatible with all isomorphic types being equi-dynamic, because a function type *can* be isomorphic to a product type (e.g. $X \to Y \cong (X \to Y) \times 1$), and for equi-dynamic types A and B, a cast $\langle B \leftarrow ? \rangle \langle ? \hookleftarrow A \rangle x$ should succeed, not fail (if it fails, then every term of A, B equal $\mho$; see the extended version). That is, disjointness axioms make equi-dynamism an intensional property of the representation of a type, and therefore stronger than isomorphism. Nonetheless, the basic rules of gradual type theory do not imply disjointness; in Section 6, we discuss a countermodel.

4 Categorical Semantics

Next, we define what a category-theoretic model of preorder and gradual type theory is, and prove that PTT/GTT are *internal languages* of these classes of models by proving soundness and completeness (i.e. initiality) theorems. This alternative axiomatic description of PTT/GTT is a useful bridge between the syntax and the concrete models presented in Section 6. The models are in *preorder categories*, which are categories internal to the category of preorders.[4] A preorder category is a category where the set of all objects and set of all arrows are each equipped with a preorder (a reflexive, transitive, but not necessarily anti-symmetric, relation). Furthermore the source, target, identity and composition functions are all *monotone* with respect to these orderings. A preorder category is equivalently a double category where one direction of morphism is thin. Intuitively, the preorder of objects represents types and type dynamism, while the preorder of morphisms represents terms and term dynamism, and we reuse the notation $\sqsubseteq$ for the orderings on objects and morphisms.

While the axioms of a preorder category are *similar to* the judgmental structure of preorder type theory, in a preorder category, morphisms have *one* source object and one target object, whereas in preorder type theory, terms have an entire *context* of inputs and one output. This is a standard mismatch between categories and type theories, and is often resolved by assuming that models have product types and using categorical products to interpret the context [13]. However, we will take a *multicategorical* view, in which our notion of model will axiomatize algebraically a notion of morphism with many inputs. Though for ordinary simple type theory the difference between the two is a matter of taste, for preorder type theory the difference is important when modeling term and specifically context dynamism. If a context is just a product of objects, then one context Γ should be less dynamic than another just when their product is, but in the syntax of our type theory, we only say a context is less dynamic than another when they are less dynamic point-wise. Since we allow for type dynamism axioms, this would mean that the syntax of context dynamism would be incomplete if it were interpreted this way. Instead, we give a multicategorical definition in which the notion of context dynamism in the model is also pointwise. Specifically, we define a model of preorder type theory to be a cartesian preorder multicategory, which is like a preorder multicategory that does not necessarily have true product *objects*, but whose morphisms' source can be a "virtual" product of objects, i.e. a context. For a general definition of multicategory that includes the notion we present, see [4]. In the extended version [20], we prove soundness and completeness of PTT for CPMs.

▶ **Definition 2** (CPM). A cartesian preorder multicategory (CPM) $\mathbb{C}$ consists of a preordered set of "objects" $\mathbb{C}_0$, a preordered set of "multiarrows" $\mathbb{C}_1$, monotone functions "source"

---

[4] To avoid confusion, these are not categories that happen to be preorders (thin categories) and these are not categories *enriched* in the category of preorders, where the hom-sets between two objects are preordered, but the objects are not.

$s : \mathbb{C}_1 \to \mathrm{Ctx}(\mathbb{C})_0$, "target" $t : \mathbb{C}_1 \to \mathbb{C}_0$, "projection" $x : \mathrm{Ctx}(\mathbb{C})_0 \times \mathbb{C}_0 \times \mathrm{Ctx}(\mathbb{C})_0 \to \mathbb{C}_1$ and composition $\circ : \mathbb{C}_1 \times_{\mathrm{Ctx}(\mathbb{C})_0} \mathrm{Ctx}(\mathbb{C})_1 \to \mathbb{C}_1$. Here $\mathrm{Ctx}(\mathbb{C})_0$ is the set of lists of objects preordered pointwise, and a substitution $\gamma \in \mathrm{Ctx}(\mathbb{C})_1(\Gamma; B_1, \ldots, B_n)$ consists of a multiarrow $\gamma(i) \in \mathbb{C}_1(\Gamma; B_i)$ for each $i \in 1, \ldots, n$, also preordered pointwise, and with composition defined in the same way as syntactic substitutions. Additionally these satisfy associativity and unitality laws (see the extended version [20]).

Gradual Typing Structures Next, we describe the additional structure on a CPM to model full gradual type theory: casts are modeled by an *equipment* [23], a dynamic type by a greatest object, and the type error by a least element of every hom-set.

▶ **Definition 3** (Gradual Structure on a CPM)**.**
1. A CPM $\mathbb{C}$ is an *equipment* if for every $A \sqsubseteq B$, there exist morphisms $u_{A,B} \in \mathbb{C}(A, B)$ and $d_{A,B} \in \mathbb{C}(B, A)$ such that $u_{A,B} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{id}_B$ and $\mathrm{id}_A \sqsubseteq u_{A,B}$ and $d_{A,B} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{id}_B$ and $\mathrm{id}_A \sqsubseteq d_{A,B}$. An equipment is *coreflective* if also $d_{A,B} \circ u_{A,B} \sqsubseteq \mathrm{id}_A$.
2. A greatest object in a CPM $\mathbb{C}$ is a greatest element of the preorder of objects $\mathbb{C}_0$.
3. A CPM $\mathbb{C}$ has local bottoms if every hom set $\mathbb{C}(A_1, \ldots, A_n; B)$ has a least element $\perp$ and for every substitution γ we have $\perp \circ \gamma \sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq \perp$.

Next, we define a *cartesian closed CPM*, which will model negative function and product types. We present the definition for function types in detail; a definition of a cartesian CPM (CPM with products) is in [20]. A *cartesian closed CPM* is a CPM with a choice of both cartesian and closed structure. Since all of the concrete models we consider are strict, we take a strict interpretation of naturality and $\beta\eta$, but this could likely be weakened.

▶ **Definition 4** (Closed CPM)**.** A Closed CPM is a CPM $\mathbb{C}$ with a monotone function on objects $\to : \mathbb{C}_0^2 \to \mathbb{C}_0$ making for every pair of objects $X, Y \in \mathbb{C}$ an "exponential" object $X \to Y$ with a monotone function $\lambda : \mathbb{C}(\Gamma, X; Y) \to \mathbb{C}(\Gamma; X \to Y)$ that is *natural* in an appropriate sense, with a morphism $\mathrm{app} \in \mathbb{C}(X \to Y, X; Y)$ such that the function given by $f \mapsto \mathrm{app} \circ (f, x(X))$ is an inverse to λ (all up to equality).

In the extended version [20], we prove the following, where a *GTT category* is a CPM that is cartesian closed, a coreflective equipment and has a greatest object and local bottoms.

▶ **Definition 5** (Interpretation of Gradual Type Theory/Soundness)**.** For any GTT signature Σ and GTT category $\mathbb{C}$ and interpretation $(\!|\cdot|\!) : \Sigma \to \mathbb{C}$ of the base types and function symbols in Σ such that all type and term dynamism axioms in Σ are true in $\mathbb{C}$, there is a compositional extension of $(\!|\cdot|\!)$ to an interpretation of all types and terms of GTT generated by Σ, such that all derivable type and term dynamism theorems are true in $\mathbb{C}$.

▶ **Theorem 6** (Completeness of GTT Category Semantics)**.** *For any GTT signature Σ, for any GTT_Σ types A, B if for every interpretation $(\!|\cdot|\!) : \Sigma \to \mathbb{C}$, $[\![A]\!] \sqsubseteq [\![B]\!]$ holds, then $A \sqsubseteq B$ is derivable. For any GTT_Σ contexts $\Phi : \Gamma \sqsubseteq \Gamma'$, types $A \sqsubseteq A'$, and terms $\Gamma \vdash t : A$ and $\Gamma' \vdash t' : A'$, if for every interpretation $[\![t]\!] \sqsubseteq [\![t']\!]$, then $\Phi \vdash t \sqsubseteq t' : A \sqsubseteq A'$ derivable.*

As usual, the proof of completeness is by building a GTT category from the syntax such that the true dynamism theorems are precisely the derivable ones.

5 Semantic Contract Interpretation

As a next step towards constructing specific GTT categories, we define a general *contract construction* that provides a semantic account of the "contract interpretation" of gradual

typing, which models a gradual type by a pair of casts. The input to our contract construction is a locally thin 2-category $\mathbb{C}$, whose objects and arrows should be thought of as the types and terms of a programming language, and each hom-set $\mathbb{C}(A, B)$ is ordered by an "approximation ordering", which is used to define term dynamism in our eventual model. We require each hom-set to have a least element (the type error), and the category to be cartesian closed (function and product types/contexts) in the strict sense of a 2-category whose underlying category is cartesian closed and where λ, application, pairing and projection are all functorial in 2-cells. The contract construction then "implements" gradual typing using the morphisms of the non-gradual "programming language" $\mathbb{C}$.

Coreflections   To build a GTT model from $\mathbb{C}$, we need to choose an interpretation of type dynamism (the ordering on objects of the CPM) that induces appropriate casts, which we know by Theorem 1.6 must be Galois connections that satisfy the retract axiom. Such Galois connections are called Galois insertions (in order theory), coreflections (in category theory) and embedding-projection pairs (in domain theory). While we presented the retract axiom earlier as an $\sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq$, in all of our models the semantics of the composition $\langle A \leftarrow B \rangle \circ \langle B \leftharpoonup A \rangle$ is strictly equal to the identity so we will make a model using "strict" coreflections because it is slightly simpler. Since type dynamism judgments must induce a coreflection, we will construct a model where the semantics of a type dynamism judgment $A \sqsubseteq B$ is literally a coreflection. However, there can be many different coreflections between two objects of our 2-category $\mathbb{C}$, so this first step of our construction does not produce a preorder category, where type dynamism is an *ordering*, but rather a *double category*. Double categories generalize preorder categories in the same way that categories generalize preorders: the ordering on objects is generalized to proof-relevant data specifying a second class of *vertical morphisms*, and the ordering on terms becomes a notion of 2-dimensional "square" between morphisms. In the model we build from $\mathbb{C}$, the vertical morphisms will model type dynamism and be coreflections, while the *(horizontal)* morphisms of a preorder category will be arbitrary morphisms of $\mathbb{C}$ and model terms. We still require only double categories that are *locally thin*, in that there is at most one 2-cell filling in any square. Thus, the first step of our contract construction can be summarized as creating a double category that is an equipment with the retract property, i.e. a double category modeling upcasts and downcasts, a slight variation on a theorem in [23]:

▶ **Definition 7** (Equipment of Coreflections [23])**.** Given a 2-category $\mathbb{C}$ we construct a (double category) equipment CoReflect($\mathbb{C}$) as follows. Its object category has $\mathbb{C}_0$ as objects and coreflections in $\mathbb{C}$ as morphisms. Horizontal morphisms are given by morphisms in $\mathbb{C}$ and a 2-cell from $f : A \to B$ to $f' : A' \to B'$ along $(u_A, d_A) : A \triangleleft A'$ and $(u_B, d_B) : B \triangleleft B'$ is a 2-cell in $\mathbb{C}$ from $u_B \circ f$ to $f' \circ u_A$ or equivalently from $f \circ d_A$ to $d_B \circ f'$. From a vertical arrow (u, d), the upcast is u and the downcast is d.

As is well-known in domain theory, any mixed-variance functor preserves coreflections [32, 27], so the product and exponential functors of $\mathbb{C}$ extend to be functorial also in vertical arrows. This produces the classic "wrapping" construction familiar from higher-order contracts [8]:$(u, d) \to (u', d') = (d \to u', u \to d')$

Vertical Slice Category   The double category CoReflect($\mathbb{C}$) is not yet a model of gradual type theory for two reasons. First, gradual type theory requires a dynamic type: every type should have a canonical coreflection into a specific type. Second, type dynamism in GTT is *proof-irrelevant*, because the rules do not track different witnesses of $A \sqsubseteq B$, but there may be different coreflections from A to B. It turns out that we can solve both problems at

once by taking what we call the "vertical slice" category over an object $D \in \mathrm{CoReflect}(\mathbb{C})$ that is rich enough to serve as a model of the dynamic type. In $\mathrm{CoReflect}(\mathbb{C})/D$, the objects are not just an object A of $\mathbb{C}$, but an object *with* a vertical morphism into D, in this case a coreflection written $(u_A, d_A) : A \triangleleft D$.[5] Thus, gradual types are modeled as coreflections into the dynamic type, analogous to Scott's "retracts of a universal domain" [22]. Then a vertical arrow from $(u_A, d_A) : A \triangleleft D$ to $(u_B, d_B) : B \triangleleft D$ is a coreflection $(u_{A,B}, d_{A,B}) : A \triangleleft B$ that *factorizes* $u_A = u_B \circ u_{A,B}$ and $d_A = d_{A,B} \circ d_B$: this means the enforcement of A's type can be thought of as also enforcing B's type. Since upcasts are monomorphisms and downcasts are epimorphisms, this factorization is *unique* if it exists, so there is at most one vertical arrow between any two objects of $\mathrm{CoReflect}(\mathbb{C})/D$. If we took the retract axiom as $\sqsupseteq\sqsubseteq$ rather than strict equality, then the factorization would only be *essentially unique*, i.e. any two factorizations would be equivalent; since our models are all strict, we defer exploring a weak variant to future work. Further, the identity coreflection $(\mathrm{id}, \mathrm{id}) : D \triangleleft D$ is a vertically greatest element since any morphism is factorized by the identity.

▶ **Definition 8** (Vertical Slice Category). Given any double category $\mathbb{E}$ and an object $D \in \mathbb{E}$, we can construct a double category $\mathbb{E}/D$ by defining $(\mathbb{E}/D)_0$ to be the slice category $\mathbb{E}_0/D$, a horizontal morphism from $(c : A \triangleleft D)$ to $(d : B \triangleleft D)$ to be a horizontal morphism from A to B in $\mathbb{E}$, and the 2-cells are similarly inherited from $\mathbb{E}$.

Next consider a cartesian closed structure on $\mathrm{CoReflect}(\mathbb{C})/D$. The action of $\rightarrow$ (respectively $\times, 1$) on objects is given by composition of the action in $\mathrm{CoReflect}(\mathbb{C})$ $(u, d) \rightarrow (u', d')$ with an *arbitrary choice* of "encoding" of the "most dynamic function type" $(u_\rightarrow, d_\rightarrow) : (D \rightarrow D) \triangleleft D$. In most of the models we consider later, D is a sum and this coreflection simply projects out of the corresponding case, failing otherwise. This reflects the separation of the function contract into "higher-order" checking $(u, d) \rightarrow (u', d')$ and "first-order tag" checking $(u_\rightarrow, d_\rightarrow)$ that has been observed in implementations [10].

Finally, we construct a multicategory $\mathrm{Multi}(\mathbb{C})$ from the double category $\mathrm{CoReflect}(\mathbb{C})/D$. A multiarrow $A_1, \ldots, A_n; B$ is given by a horizontal arrow $A_1 \times \ldots \times A_n; B$ in $\mathrm{CoReflect}(\mathbb{C})/D$. The ordering $A \sqsubseteq A'$ is given by the vertical arrows $A \triangleleft A'$ of $\mathrm{CoReflect}(\mathbb{C})/D$ (i.e. coreflections), which is lifted pointwise to contexts by the definition of a CPM. The ordering $f : (A_1, \ldots, A_n; B) \sqsubseteq g : (A'_1, \ldots, A'_n; B')$ is given by squares in $\mathrm{CoReflect}(\mathbb{C})/D$ (using the action/monotonicity of $\times$ on the pointwise orderings $A_i \sqsubseteq A'_i$ of the context). Combining these constructions, we produce:

▶ **Theorem 9** (Contract Model of Gradual Typing). *If $\mathbb{C}$ is a locally thin cartesian closed 2-category with local $\bot$s, then for any object $D \in \mathbb{C}$ with chosen coreflections $c_\rightarrow : (D \rightarrow D) \triangleleft D$, $c_\times : (D \times D) \triangleleft D$, and $c_1 : 1 \triangleleft D$, then $(\mathrm{Multi}(\mathrm{CoReflect}(\mathbb{C})/id_d), c_\rightarrow, c_\times, c_1)$ is a GTT category.*

6   Concrete Models

Next, we produce some concrete models by instantiating Theorem 9.

There are two models based on domains that are operationally *inadequate* in that they identify the dynamic type error and diverging programs: term dynamism is given by the "definedness ordering" of domain theory. Both are based on the 2-category of domains (ω-cppos), continuous functions, and the domain ordering on functions, with different choices of universal domain. The first is merely a new presentation of Dana Scott's classical models

---

[5] We do not write $A \sqsubseteq D$ because coreflections are not a preorder.

of untyped λ-calculus, showing that Scott's model is already a model of gradual typing [22]. That is, we find the solution to the recursive domain equation $D \cong \mathbb{N}_\perp \oplus (D \times D) \oplus (D \to D)$ where $\oplus$ is the coalesced sum of domains. The classical technique for solving this equation naturally produce the required coreflections $(D \times D) \triangleleft D$ and $(D \to D) \triangleleft D$. The second is a variation where product and function types have overlapping representation, showing that the product and function types cannot be proven disjoint in gradual type theory. To do this, we construct a universal domain as a *product* of basic connectives rather than a sum: $D' \cong \mathbb{N}_\perp \times (D' \times D') \times (D' \to D')$. This is a kind of "coinductive"/"object-oriented" dynamic type: an element of the dynamic type responds to messages (given by the projections), and if it "doesn't implement" a message it returns $\perp$. Then $\langle (? \times ?) \leftarrow ? \rangle \langle ? \leftarrow (? \to ?) \rangle x \not\equiv \mho$ the domain has elements that are non-trivial in both the $D \times D$ and $D \to D$ positions.

Next, to produce a domain theoretic model that is adequate, we want a notion of domain that has, in addition to the definedness ordering needed for solving recursive domain equations, a *separate* notion of type error and error-approximation ordering. This can be accomplished using "pointed domain preorders", which are both domains and preorders with a least element in a compatible way. First, the diverging element must be *maximal* in the error ordering, so that they are sufficiently independent. Next, the error ordering must be an admissible relation so that the set of monotone functions is closed under limits.

▶ **Definition 10** ((Pointed) Domain Preorder)**.** A domain preorder is a set X with two orderings $\leq$ and $\sqsubseteq$ such that $(X, \leq)$ is an ω-cppo with $\leq$-least element $\perp$ and $\sqsubseteq$ is a preorder closed under limits of $\leq$-ω-chains such that $\perp$ is $\sqsubseteq$-maximal. A continuous function of domain preorders is a function of the underlying sets that is continuous with respect to $\leq$ and monotone with respect to $\sqsubseteq$. A domain preorder is *pointed* if it has a $\sqsubseteq$-least element $\mho$.

The model is given by the 2-category of *pointed* domain preorders, with the $\sqsubseteq$ ordering, but to solve domain equations we use the category of all domain preorders. The 2-category with the domain ordering satisfies the criteria of [27] and so we can construct a suitable domain preorder by solving a similar equation to Scott's model: $D \cong \mathbb{N}_{\perp,\mho} \oplus (D_\mho \times D_\mho) \oplus (D_\mho \to D_\mho)$, where $D_\mho$ freely adjoins a $\sqsubseteq$-least element. Then the dynamic type is given by $D_\mho$, and we can construct coreflections (with respect to $\sqsubseteq$) $(D_\mho \times D_\mho) \triangleleft D_\mho$ and $(D_\mho \to D) \triangleleft D$: the downcast produces $\mho$ unless it is the $D \times D$ (respectively $D \to D$) case and the $1 \triangleleft D$ is the unique coreflection between those objects. We need the fact that $\perp$ is maximal to prove these functions are monotone, see the extended version for more details [20].

7   Related and Future Work

Our logic and semantics of type and term dynamism builds on the formulation introduced with the gradual guarantee in [24], but the rules of our system differ in two key ways. First, our system includes the β, η equivalences as equi-dynamism axioms, making term dynamism a more semantic notion. Second, we only allow casts that are either upcasts or downcasts (as defined by type dynamism), whereas their system allows for a more liberal "compatibility" condition. Accordingly our rules of dynamism for casts are slightly different, but where it makes sense, the rules of the two systems are interderivable.

Our semantic model of contracts as coreflections has precedent in much previous work, though we are the first to make precise the relationship to gradual typing's notions of type and term dynamism.

Henglein's work [10] on dynamic typing defines casts that are retracts to the dynamic type, introduced the upcast-followed-by-downcast factorization that we use here, and defines a syntactic rewriting relation similar to our term dynamism rules. Further they define a

"subtyping" relation that is the same as type dynamism and characterize it by a semantic property analogous to the semantics of type dynamism in our contract model. The upcast-downcast factorization of an arbitrary cast is superficially similar to the work on triple casts in [26], which collapse a sequence of casts starting at A and ending at B into a downcast to $A \sqcap B$ followed by an upcast to B. But note that this factorization is opposite (downcast and then upcast), and the upcast-downcast factorization requires only a dynamic type, while the converse requires an appropriate middle type, similarly to *image factorization*. Moreover, [9] shows that the correctness of factorization through $A \sqcap B$ is not always possible.

Findler and Blume's work on contracts as *pairs of projections* [7] is also similar. There a contract is defined in an untyped language to be given by a *pair* of functions that divide enforcement of a type between the a "positive" component that checks the term and a "negative" component that checks the continuation, naturally supporting a definition of *blame* when a contract is violated. We give no formal treatment of blame in this paper, but our separation into upcasts and downcasts naturally supports a definition of blame analogous to theirs. In their paper, each component c is idempotent and satisfies $c \sqsubseteq \mathrm{id}$. Their work is fundamentally untyped so a direct comparison is difficult.

Recent work on interoperability in a (non-gradual) dependently typed language [5] defines several variations of Galois connections to serve as models of casts with different properties. This work validates their comments that ordinary monotone Galois connections serve as a model of the upcasts and downcasts associated to type precision.

There are two recent proposals for a more general theory of gradual typing: Abstracting Gradual Typing (AGT) [9] and the Gradualizer [3]. Broadly, their systems and ours are similar in that type dynamism and graduality are central and a gradually typed language is constructed from a statically typed language. Gradual type theory is quite different in that it is based on an axiomatic semantics, whereas both of theirs are based on operational semantics. As such our notion of gradual type soundness is stronger than theirs: we assert program equivalences whereas their soundness theorem is related to the syntactic type soundness theorem of the static language. Their systems also develop a *surface syntax* for gradually typed languages (including implicit casts and gradual type checking), whereas our logic here only applies to the *runtime semantics* of the language. Finally, AGT is based on abstract interpretation and uses a Galois insertion between gradual types and sets of static types, but we do not see a precise relationship to our use of coreflections.

Relative to this related work, we believe the axiomatic specification of casts via a universal property relative to dynamism is a new idea in gradual typing, as is our categorical semantics and the presentation of the contract interpretation as a model construction.

In this paper we have shown that the combination of soundness and graduality produces strong specifications for call-by-name gradual typing implementations. However so far we have only validated this by denotational semantics, and we plan to develop *operational models* of this kind of gradual type theory where term dynamism is modeled by a type of contextual approximation. We also will investigate extensions to richer languages. First, we would like to develop a similar theory for call-by-value gradual typing, as every gradually typed language in use today is call-by-value. We plan to build on existing work on categorical semantics and universal properties of types in call-by-value [15, 28]. The combination of gradual typing and parametric polymorphism has proven quite complex [17, 19, 1, 12]. If we could show that the combination of graduality with parametricity has a unique implementation, as we have shown here for simple typing, it would provide a strong semantic justification for a design.

──── **References** ────

1   Amal Ahmed, Dustin Jamner, Jeremy G. Siek, and Philip Wadler. Theorems for free for free: Parametricity, with and without types. In *International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP)*, 2017.

2   Felipe Bañados Schwerter, Ronald Garcia, and Éric Tanter. A theory of gradual effect systems. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming*, ICFP '14, pages 283–295, 2014.

3   Matteo Cimini and Jeremy G. Siek. Automatically generating the dynamic semantics of gradually typed languages. In *Proceedings of the 44th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, POPL 2017, pages 789–803, 2017.

4   G. S. H. Cruttwell and Michael A. Shulman. A unified framework for generalized multicategories. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 24(21), 2009. `arXiv:arXiv:0907.2460`.

5   Pierre-Evariste Dagand, Nicolas Tabareau, and Éric Tanter. Foundations of Dependent Interoperability. working paper or preprint, 2017. URL: `https://hal.inria.fr/hal-01629909`.

6   Matthias Felleisen. On the expressive power of programming languages. *ESOP'90*, 1990.

7   Robby Findler and Matthias Blume. Contracts as pairs of projections. In *International Symposium on Functional and Logic Programming (FLOPS)*, 2006.

8   Robert Bruce Findler and Matthias Felleisen. Contracts for higher-order functions. In *International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP)*, pages 48–59, sep 2002.

9   Ronald Garcia, Alison M. Clark, and Éric Tanter. Abstracting gradual typing. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*, 2016.

10 Fritz Henglein. Dynamic typing: Syntax and proof theory. 22(3):197–230, 1994.

11 Atsushi Igarashi, Peter Thiemann, Vasco Vasconcelos, and Philip Wadler. Gradual session types. In *International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP)*, 2017.

12 Yuu Igarashi, Taro Sekiyama, and Atsushi Igarashi. On polymorphic gradual typing. In *International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP), Oxford, United Kingdom*, 2017.

13 J. Lambek and P. J. Scott. *Introduction to Higher Order Categorical Logic*. Cambridge University Press, 1986.

14 Nico Lehmann and Éric Tanter. Gradual refinement types. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*, 2017.

15 Paul Blain Levy. *Call-by-Push-Value*. Ph. D. dissertation, Queen Mary, University of London, London, UK, mar 2001.

16 Per Martin-Löf. On the meanings of the logical constants and the justifications of the logical laws (sienna lectures). *Nordic Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 1(1):11–60, 1983/1996.

17 Jacob Matthews and Amal Ahmed. Parametric polymorphism through run-time sealing, or, theorems for low, low prices! In *European Symposium on Programming (ESOP)*, mar 2008.

18 Eugenio Moggi. Notions of computation and monads. *Inform. And Computation*, 93(1), 1991.

19 Georg Neis, Derek Dreyer, and Andreas Rossberg. Non-parametric parametricity. In *International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP)*, pages 135–148, sep 2009.

20 Max S. New and Daniel R. Licata. Call-by-name gradual type theory. *CoRR*, 2018. URL: `https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.00061`.

21 Frank Pfenning and Rowan Davies. A judgmental reconstruction of modal logic. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 11:511–540, 2001.

22 Dana Scott. Data types as lattices. *Siam Journal on computing*, 5(3):522–587, 1976.

23 Michael Shulman. Framed bicategories and monoidal fibrations. *Theory and Applications of Categories*, 20(18):650–738, 2008.

24 Jeremy Siek, Micahel Vitousek, Matteo Cimini, and John Tang Boyland. Refined criteria for gradual typing. In *1st Summit on Advances in Programming Languages*, SNAPL 2015, 2015.

25 Jeremy G. Siek and Walid Taha. Gradual typing for functional languages. In *Scheme and Functional Programming Workshop (Scheme)*, pages 81–92, 2006.

26 Jeremy G. Siek and Philip Wadler. Threesomes, with and without blame. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*, pages 365–376, 2010.

27 Michael B Smyth and Gordon D Plotkin. The category-theoretic solution of recursive domain equations. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 11(4), 1982.

28 Sam Staton and Paul Blain Levy. Universal properties of impure programming languages. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*, 2013.

29 Sam Tobin-Hochstadt and Matthias Felleisen. Interlanguage migration: From scripts to programs. In *Dynamic Languages Symposium (DLS)*, pages 964–974, 2006.

30 Sam Tobin-Hochstadt and Matthias Felleisen. The design and implementation of typed scheme. In *ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL), San Francisco, California*, 2008.

31 Philip Wadler and Robert Bruce Findler. Well-typed programs can't be blamed. In *European Symposium on Programming (ESOP)*, pages 1–16, 2009.

32 Mitchell Wand. Fixed-point constructions in order-enriched categories. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 8(1):13–30, 1979.

33 Roger Wolff, Ronald Garcia, Éric Tanter, and Jonathan Aldrich. Gradual typestate. In *Proceedings of the 25th European Conference on Object-oriented Programming*, ECOOP'11, 2011.