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Abstract

Session types are a rich type discipline, based on linear types, that lifts the sort of safety claims that come with type systems to communications. However, web-based applications and microservices are often written in a mix of languages, with type disciplines in a spectrum between static and dynamic typing. Gradual session types address this mixed setting by providing a framework which grants seamless transition between statically typed handling of sessions and any required degree of dynamic typing.

We propose Gradual GV as a gradually typed extension of the functional session type system GV. Following a standard framework of gradual typing, Gradual GV consists of an external language, which relaxes the type system of GV using dynamic types, and an internal language with casts, for which operational semantics is given, and a cast-insertion translation from the former to the latter. We demonstrate type and communication safety as well as blame safety, thus extending previous results to functional languages with session-based communication. The interplay of linearity and dynamic types requires a novel approach to specifying the dynamics of the language.

1 Introduction

It was the best of types, it was the worst of types.

Type systems are retreating from areas they used to dominate, with statically-typed languages such as Java seen as old hat while dynamically-typed languages such as Javascript, Python, and R are on the rise. Simultaneously, type systems are expanding into new domains, such as dependent types in Agda, Coq, and Idris, effect types in Eff, Frank, and Koka, and session types in Links, Scribble, and Singularity OS.

Gradually-typed languages reconcile these two trends. They permit one to assemble programs with some components written in a statically-typed language and some in a dynamically-typed language. Gradually-typed languages have been widely explored in both theory and practice, beginning with contracts in Racket and continuing with Mi-
crosoft’s TypeScript and Facebook’s Hack and Flow. Many systems, such as Racket and TypeScript TPD, rely on contracts or similar constructs to ensure that dynamically-typed values adhere to statically-typed constraints when values pass from one world to the other.

At first blush, one might consider gradual types as largely a response to the former trend: they provide a way for developers using dynamically-typed languages to evolve their code toward statically-typed languages that are easier to maintain. But on second thought, one might consider gradual types as even more helpful in light of the latter trend. When it comes to dependent types, effect types, or session types the fraction of programmers working in languages that offer static checking for such types is essentially zero. In this sense, all of us can benefit from a way to evolve toward languages with more precise type systems.

In consequence, an important line of research is to extend gradual typing so that it not only relates statically-typed and dynamically-typed languages, but also relates less-precisely-typed and more-precisely-typed languages. There is a small body of research on doing so for dependent types and effect types, which we review in the section on related work. This paper presents the first system that extends gradual typing to session types.

Session types were introduced by Honda (1993), drawing on Milner’s π-calculus (Milner et al., 1992) and Girard’s linear logic (Girard, 1987), and further developed by many others (Honda et al., 1998; Yoshida & Vasconcelos, 2007). Gay and Hole (2005) introduced subtyping for session types, and session types were embedded into a functional language with linear types, similar to the one used in this paper, by Gay and Vasconcelos (2010). Caires, Pfenning, Toninho, and Wadler introduced propositions-as-types interpretations of session types in linear logic (Caires & Pfenning, 2010; Caires et al., 2014; Wadler, 2012; Wadler, 2014). One important line of research is multiparty session types (Honda et al., 2008; Honda et al., 2016) but we confine our attention here to dyadic session types.

Session types have been adapted to a variety of languages, either statically or dynamically checked, and using either libraries or additions to the toolchain; implementations include C, Erlang, Go, Haskell, Java, Python, Rust, and Scala. New languages incorporating session types include C0, Links, SePi, SILL, and Singularity. Industrial uses of session types include: Red Hat’s support of the Scribble specification language, which has been used as a common interface for several systems based on session types; Thoughtworks’s use of session types to manage microservices; and the Ocean Observatories Initiative’s use of dynamically-checked session types in Python. Session types inspired an entire line of research on what has come to be called behavioural types, the subject of EU COST action BETTY, a recent Shonan meeting, and a recent Dagstuhl seminar.

Here is a simple session type encoding of a protocol to purchase an online video:

$$S_{\text{video}} = \text{!string, ?int, } \oplus \{ \text{buy : !CC, ?URL, end}, \text{quit : end} \}.$$  

It describes a channel endpoint along which a client sends the name of a video as a string, receives its cost as an integer, and then selects either to buy the video, in which case one sends a credit card number, receives a URL from which the video may be downloaded, and waits for an indication that the channel has been closed, or selects to quit and closes the channel. There is a dual session type for server at the other end of the channel, where ! (write) is swapped with ? (read), ⊕ (select from a choice) is swapped with & (offer a choice), and end (close a channel) is swapped with end (wait for a channel to close).
Session types are necessarily linear. Let \( x \) be bound to a string and let \( c \) be bound to a channel endpoint of type \( S_{\text{video}}. \) Performing

\[
\text{let } d = \text{send } x c \text{ in } \ldots
\]

binds \( d \) to a channel endpoint of type \( R, \) where \( S_{\text{video}} = \text{!string}. R. \) To avoid sending a string to the same channel twice, it is essential that \( c \) must be bound to the only reference to the channel endpoint before the operation, and for similar reasons \( d \) must be bound to the only reference to the channel endpoint after. Such restrictions can easily be enforced in a statically-typed language with an affine type discipline. Linearity is required to guarantee that channels are not abandoned before they are closed.

But how is one to ensure linearity in a dynamically-typed language? Following (Tov & Pucella, 2010), we require that each dynamically-typed reference to a channel endpoint is equipped with a lock, and after the channel is used once the reference is locked to ensure it cannot be used again. To ensure that each channel is appropriately terminated, with either a wait or a close operation, garbage collection flags an error if a dynamically-typed reference to a channel becomes inaccessible.

Our system is the first to integrate static and dynamic session types. It preserves the safety properties of statically-typed sessions, namely progress, preservation, and absence of run-time errors. The latter includes session fidelity: every send is matched with a receive, every select is matched with an offer, and every wait is matched with close. Many, but not all, systems with session types support recursive session types, and many, but not all, systems with session types ensure deadlock freedom; we leave such developments for future work.

We give our system a compact formulation along the lines of the blame calculus (Wadler & Findler, 2009), based on the notion of a cast to mediate interactions between more-precisely typed (e.g., statically typed) and less-precisely typed (e.g., dynamically typed) components of a program. We define the usual four subtyping relations, ordinary, positive, negative, and naive, and show the usual results, including a tangram theorem relating the four forms of subtyping and blame safety. A corollary of our results is that in any interaction between more-precisely typed and less-precisely typed components of a program, any cast error is due to the less-precisely typed component.

Our paper makes the following contributions.

- Section 2 provides an overview of the novel techniques in our work, and how we dynamically enforce linearity and session types.
- Section 3 describes a complete formal calculus, including syntax, reduction rules, typing rules of both external and internal languages, cast-insertion translation from the external to the internal language, and embedding of a dynamically typed language with channel-based communication into our calculus.
- Section 4 presents standard results for our calculus, including progress and preservation, session fidelity, the tangram theorem, blame safety, conservativity of the external language typing over the GV typing, and type preservation of the cast insertion translation.

Section 5 describes related work and Section 6 concludes.
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Compared to the previous paper (Igarashi et al., 2017), we extend the development with the external language, the cast-insertion translation, a type checker, and proofs of their properties as well as more detailed proofs for the earlier results. These extensions make gradual session types accessible for the programmer, who works in the external language.

2 Motivation

Sy and Rob are programmers, who work together on a project that relies on microservices. Sy is a strong advocate of static typing and relies on an implementation language that supports session types out of the box. Rob, on the other hand, is a strong advocate of dynamically typed languages. One of the credos of microservices architectures is that the implementation of a service endpoint is language-agnostic, which means it can be implemented in any programming language whatsoever as long as it adheres to its protocol. However, Sy does not want to compromise the strong guarantees (e.g., type safety, session fidelity) of the statically typed code by communicating with Rob’s client. Rob is also keen on having strong guarantees, but does not mind if they are enforced at run time. Here is the story how they can collaborate safely using Gradual GV, our proposal for a gradually typed functional language with synchronous binary session types.

2.1 A Compute Service

The compute service is one of the “hello world” programs of the session-type community and it is a simplified version of one of the protocols in Sy and Rob’s project. This service involves two peers, a server and a client, connected via a communication link. The server runs a protocol that first offers a choice of two arithmetic operations, negation or addition, then reads one or two numbers depending on the operation, outputs the result of applying the selected operation to its operand(s), and finally closes the connection. The client chooses an operation by sending the server a label, which is either neg or add indicating the choice of negation or addition, respectively. In session-type notation, the server’s view of the compute protocol reads as follows.

\[
\text{Compute} = \&\{\text{neg} : \text{?int.}!\text{int.end}, \text{add} : \text{?int.?int.}!\text{int.end}\}
\]

Sy chooses to implement the server in the language GV that is inspired by previous work (Gay & Vasconcelos, 2010) and that we will describe formally in Section 3.

\[
\text{computeServer} : \text{Compute} \to \text{unit}
\]

\[
\text{computeServer} \ c = \begin{cases}
\text{neg} : \ c . \ \text{let} \ v1, c = \text{receive} \ c \ \text{in}
\text{let} \ c = \text{send} \ (-v1) \ c \ \text{in}
\text{close} \ c ; \\
\text{add} : \ c . \ \text{let} \ v1, c = \text{receive} \ c \ \text{in}
\text{let} \ v2, c = \text{receive} \ c \ \text{in}
\text{let} \ c = \text{send} \ (v1+v2) \ c \ \text{in}
\text{close} \ c
\end{cases}
\]
The parameter $c$ of type Compute is the server’s endpoint of the communication link to the client (when unambiguous, we often just say endpoint or channel). The case $c$ of ... expression receives the client’s choice on channel $c$ in the form of a label `neg` or `add` and branches accordingly. The notation “c.” in each branch (re-)binds the variable $c$ to the channel in the state after the transmission has happened. The type of $c$ is updated to the session type corresponding to the respective branch in the Compute type. The receive $c$ operation receives a value on channel $c$ and returns a pair of the received value and the depleted channel with a correspondingly depleted session type. Analogously, the send $v$ $c$ operation sends value $v$ on channel $c$ and returns the depleted channel. The final close $c$ disconnects the communication link by closing the channel.

### 2.2 The View from the Client Side

A client of the Compute protocol communicates on a channel with the protocol ComputeD defined below. This protocol is the dual of Compute which (roughly) swaps all sending and receiving operations.

$$\text{ComputeD} = \oplus \{ \text{neg} : \text{!int.?int.end}, \text{add} : \text{!int.!int.?int.end} \}$$

Clients of the compute service may always select the same operation and then proceed linearly according the corresponding branch. Such clients can use a simpler supertype of ComputeD with a unary internal choice. For example, a client that only ever asks for negation can implement ComputeDneg.

$$\text{ComputeDneg} = \oplus \{ \text{neg} : \text{!int.?int.end} \}$$

Here is Sy’s implementation of a typed client for ComputeDneg.

```text
negationClient : int -> ComputeDneg -> int
negationClient v c =
  let c = select neg c in
  let c = send v c in
  let y, c = receive c in
  let _ = wait c in
  y
```

There are two new operations in the client code. The `select neg c` operation selects the `neg` branch in the protocol by sending the `neg` label to the server. It returns a channel to run the selected branch of the protocol with type `!int.?int.end`. The `wait c` operation matches the `close c` operation on the server and disconnects the client.

### 2.3 A Untyped Server

To test some new features, Rob also implements the Compute protocol, but does so in the untyped language Uni GV, which is strongly typed like Racket or Python but does not impose a static typing discipline. Here is Rob’s implementation of the server.

```text
-- untyped
dynServer c =
  case c of {
```
serveOp\ n\ op\ c =
  \text{if } n == 0 \text{ then}
  \text{close (send op c)}
  \text{else}
  \text{let } v , c = \text{receive c in}
  \text{serveOp} (n-1) (op v) c

The main function \text{dynServer} takes a channel \text{c} on which it receives the client’s selection. It delegates to an auxiliary function \text{serveOp} that takes the arity of a function, the function itself, and the channel end on which to receive the arguments and to send the result. The \text{serveOp} function counts down the number of remaining function applications in the first argument, accumulates partial function applications in the second argument, and propagates the channel end in the third argument.

It is easy to see that the \text{dynServer} function implements the \text{Compute} protocol. Rob chose this style of implementation because it is amenable to experimentation with protocol extensions: the function \text{dynServer} is trivially extensible to new operations and types by adding new lines to the \text{case} dispatch.

\subsection*{2.4 The Gradual Way}

How can we embed Rob’s server with other program fragments in the typed language (e.g., Sy’s client) while retaining as many typing guarantees as possible?

One answer would be to use a dependently typed system that can describe the type of the \text{serveOp} function adequately. In an extension of a recently proposed system (Toninho & Yoshida, 2018) with iteration on natural numbers and large elimination, we might write that code as follows.

\begin{verbatim}
Op : \text{nat} \rightarrow \text{Type}
Op 0 = \text{int}
Op (n+1) = \text{int} \rightarrow \text{Op}\ n

Ch : \text{nat} \rightarrow \text{Session}
Ch 0 = \text{!int . end}:
Ch (n+1) = ?\text{int} . \text{Ch}\ n

serveOpDep : (n : \text{nat}) (op : \text{Op}\ n) (c : \text{Ch}\ n) \rightarrow \text{unit}
serveOpDep 0 op c = \text{close (send op c)}
serveOpDep (n+1) op c = \text{let } v , c = \text{receive c in}
  \text{serveOpDep}\ n\ (op\ v)\ c
\end{verbatim}

However, we are not aware of a fully developed theory of a session-type system that would be able to process this definition.

An alternative that is immediately available is to resort to gradual typing. For this particular program it will insert casts to make the program type check, but all those casts are semantically guaranteed to succeed because it would have a dependent type. To this end, we rewrite the function \text{dynServer} in a gradually type external language analogous to
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the gradually typed lambda calculus GTLC (Siek et al., 2015b), but extended with GV’s communication operations.

In our example, the rewrite to the external language boils down to providing suitable type signatures for dynServer and serveOp:

dynServer : Compute → unit
serveOp : int → * → ⋄ → unit

The first argument n of dynServe is consistently handled as an integer, so its type is int. The second argument op is invoked with values of type int → int → int, and int; these types are subsumed to the dynamic type *. Similarly to other gradual type systems, an expression of type * can be used in any context, e.g., addition, function application, or even communication, and any value can be passed where * is expected. The third argument c is invoked with channels of different types: ?int.?int.! int.end., ?int.?int.! int.end., and ! int.end.. These types are subsumed to a type that is novel to this work, the dynamic session type, ⋄, a linear type which subsumes all session types. It is important to see that the channel c is handled linearly in functions dynServer and serveOp. For that reason, the role and handling of the linear dynamic session type with respect to the set of session types is analogous to the role and handling of * with respect to general types, as shown in earlier work (Fennell & Thiemann, 2012; Thiemann, 2014). Aside from the type annotation, the code remains exactly the same as in the unityped case.

The external language comes with a translation into a blame calculus with explicit casts. This translation inserts just the casts that are necessary to make typing of the code go through. Here is the output of this translation (suffix Cast is appended to the names of the functions to distinguish different versions):

dynServerCast : Compute → unit
dynServerCast c =
    case c of {
        neg: c. serveOpCast 1 ((λx.−x) : int → int ⇒ *)
            (c : ?int.! int.end. ⇒ ⋄);
        add: c. serveOpCast 2 ((λx.λy.x+y) : int → int → int ⇒ *)
            (c : ?int.?int.! int.end. ⇒ ⋄)
    }

serveOpCast : int → * → ⋄ → unit
serveOpCast n op c =
    if n==0 then
        close (send op (c : ⋄ ⇒ !*. end.))
    else
        let v, c = receive (c : ⋄ ⇒ ?*. ⋄) in
        serveOpCast (n−1) ((op : * ⇒ * ⇒ *) v) c

Casts are inserted where values are converted from/to * or ⋄, similarly to the translation from GTLC. The resulting casts in dynServerCast and serveOpCast look fairly involved, but we should keep in mind that the programmer does not have to write them as they result from the translation.
2.5 Dynamic Linearity

The refined criteria for gradual typing (Siek et al., 2015b) postulate that a gradual type system should come with a full embedding of a unityped calculus. This embedding (which we indicate by ceiling brackets $⌈…⌉$) extends the embedding given for the simply-typed lambda calculus (Wadler & Findler, 2009) to handle the operations on sessions (see Figure 14 for its definition).

For example, (the unityped version of) the dynServer as written by Rob is compiled and embedded into the gradually typed language as a value $\text{dynServer : } ⋆$. To directly incorporate Rob’s code, the gradual type checker enables Sy to write a function $\text{callDynServer}$ that accepts a channel of type Compute and returns a value of type unit, but internally just calls dynServer.

$$\text{callDynServer : Compute } → \text{unit}$$
$$\text{callDynServer c = dynServer c}$$

The gradual type checker translates the definition of callDynServer by inserting the appropriate casts: it casts the embedded dynServer (of type $⋆$) to the function type $⋆ → ⋆$, it casts the channel argument to this function to $⋆$, and it casts the result to unit.

$$\text{callDynServer : Compute } → \text{unit}$$
$$\text{callDynServer c = (dynServer : ⋆ } ⇒ ⋆ → ⋆) (c : \text{Compute } ⇒ ⋆) : ⋆ ⇒ \text{unit}$$

The casts inserted in this code make Sy’s expectations completely obvious: dynServer must be a function and it is expected to use $c$ as a channel of type Compute. Any misuse will allocate blame to the respective cast in dynServer. (We omit blame labels in the examples for simplicity.)

One kind of misuse that we have not discussed, yet, is compromising linearity: Sy has no guarantee that Rob’s code does not accidentally duplicate or drop the communication channel. Both actions can lead to protocol violations, which should be detected at runtime. Gradual GV takes care of linearity by factoring the cast $(c : \text{Compute } ⇒ ⋆)$ through the dynamic session type $⋆⃝:

$$(c : \text{Compute } ⇒ ⋆) : ⋆⃝ ⇒ ⋆)$$

The first part is a cast among linear (session) types and it can be handled as outlined in Section 2.4. The second part is a cast from a linear type (which could be a session type, a linear function type, or a linear product) to the unrestricted dynamic type $⋆$.

A cast from a linear type to unrestricted $⋆$ is a novelty of Gradual GV. Operationally, the cast introduces an indirection through a store: it takes a linear value as an argument, allocates a new cell in the store, moves the linear value along with a representation of its type into the cell, and returns a handle $a$ to the cell as an unrestricted value of type $⋆$. Gradual GV represents the cell by a process and creates handles by introducing an appropriate binder so that a process of the form $E[y : ⋆⃝ ⇒ ⋆]$ reduces to $(va ⇒ v : ⋆⃝ ⇒ ⋆)E[a]$. Linear use of this cell is controlled at runtime using ideas for run-time monitoring of affine types (Tov & Pucella, 2010; Padovani, 2017).

Any access to a cell comes in the guise of a cast $a : ⋆ ⇒ T$ from $⋆$ to another type applied to a handle $a$. If the first access to the cell is a cast from $⋆$ to a linear type consistent with the
type representation stored in the cell, then the cast returns the linear value and empties the cell. Any subsequent access to the same cell results in a linearity violation which allocates blame to the label on the cast from \( \star \). If the first cast attempts to convert to an inconsistent type, then blame is allocated to that cast. In addition, there is a garbage collection rule that fires when the handle of a full cell is no longer reachable from any process. It allocates blame to the context of the cast to \( \star \) because that cast violated the linearity protocol by dismissing the handle.

### 2.6 End-to-end Dynamicity

The examples so far tacitly assume that channels are created with a fully specified session type that provides a “ground truth” for the protocol on this channel. Later on, channels may be cast to \( \odot \) and on to \( \star \), but essentially they adhere to the ground truth established at their creation.

Unfortunately, this view cannot be upheld in a calculus that is able to embed a unityped language like Uni GV. When writing \texttt{new} in a unityped program to create a channel, Rob (hopefully) has some session type in mind, but it is not manifest in the code.

In the typed setting, \texttt{new} returns a linear pair of session endpoints of type \( S \times_{\text{lin}} \overline{S} \) where \( S \) is the server session type and \( \overline{S} \) its dual client counterpart (cf. the \texttt{Compute} and \texttt{ComputeD} types in Sections 2.1 and 2.2). When embedding the unityped \texttt{new}, the session type \( S \) is unknown. Hence, the embedding needs to create a channel without an inherent ground truth session type. It does so by assigning both channel ends type \( \odot \) and casting it to \( \star \) as in \texttt{new:} \( \odot \times_{\text{lin}} \odot \Rightarrow \star \). To make this work, the dynamic session type \( \odot \) is considered self-dual, that is \( \odot = \odot \). Gradual GV offers no static guarantees for either end of such a channel.

To see what run-time guarantees Gradual GV can offer for a channel of unknown session type, let’s consider the embedding of the dynamic send and receive operations that may be applied to it. The embedded send operation takes two arguments of type \( \star \), for the value and the channel, and returns the updated channel wrapped in type \( \star \). The embedded receive operation takes a wrapped channel of type \( \star \) and returns a (\( \star \)-wrapped) pair of the received value and the updated channel.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{send}_e & = (\text{send } [e] (\langle f \rangle: \star \xrightarrow{p} !\star.\odot)) : \odot \Rightarrow \star \\
\text{receive}_e & = (\text{receive } ([e]: \star \xrightarrow{p} ?\star.\odot)) : \star \times_{\text{lin}} \odot \Rightarrow \star
\end{align*}
\]

Now consider running the following unityped program with entry point \texttt{main}. 

```plaintext
1 client cc = 
2   let v, cc = receive cc in wait cc
3 server cs = 
4   let cs = send 42 cs in close cs
5 main = 
6   let cs, cc = new in
7   let _ = fork (client cc) in
8   server cs
```
After a few computation steps, it reaches a configuration where the client and the server have reduced to \((\nu_{cs}, cs) (\text{client} \mid \text{server})\) where
\[
\text{client} = \langle E[\text{receive}(cc: \circ \Rightarrow ?.\circ)): \circ \times_{\text{lin}} \circ \Rightarrow \ast]\rangle
\]
\[
\text{server} = \langle F[\text{send}(42 : \text{int} \Rightarrow \ast)(cs: \ast \Rightarrow \circ)): \circ \Rightarrow \ast]\rangle
\]
for some contexts \(E\) and \(F\). The channel ends \(cc: \circ\) and \(cs: \circ\) are the two ends of the channel created in line 6. Fortunately, the two processes use the channel consistently as the cast target \(? . \circ\) on one end is dual to the cast target \(! . \circ\) at the other end. Hence, Gradual GV has a reduction that drops the casts at both ends in this situation, and retypes the ends to \(cc: ? . \circ\) and \(cs: ! . \circ\), respectively.

Implementing this reduction requires communication between the two processes to check the cast targets for consistency. While our formal presentation abstracts over this implementation issue, we observe that a single asynchronous message exchange is sufficient: Each cast first sends its target type and then receives the target type of the cast at the other end. Then both processes check locally whether the target types are duals of one another. If they are, then both processes continue; otherwise they allocate blame. As both ends perform the same comparison, the outcome is the same in both processes.

## 3 GV and Gradual GV

### 3.1 GV

We begin by discussing a language GV with session types but without gradual types. GV is inspired by both the Gay and Vasconcelos’ functional session type calculus (Gay & Vasconcelos, 2010) and Wadler’s ‘good variant’ of the language (Wadler, 2012; Wadler, 2014). Unlike the latter, we do not guarantee deadlock freedom.

#### 3.1.1 Types and subtyping

Figure 1 summarises types of GV. Let \(m, n\) range over multiplicities for types whose use is either unrestricted, \(\text{un}\), or must be linear, \(\text{lin}\).

Let \(T, U\) range over types, which include: unit type, \(\text{unit}\); unrestricted and linear function types, \(T \rightarrow_m U\); unrestricted and linear product types, \(T \times_m U\); and session types. One might also wish to include booleans or base types, but we omit these as they can be dealt with analogously to \(\text{unit}\).

Let \(l\) range over labels used for selection and case choices. Let \(S, R\) range over session types that describe communication protocols for channel endpoints, which include: send \(! T.S\), to send a value of type \(T\) and then behave as \(S\); receive \(? T.S\), to receive a value of type \(T\) and then behave as \(S\); select \(\circ \{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}\), to send one of the labels \(l_i\) and then behave as \(S_i\); case \& \(\{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}\) to receive any of the labels \(l_i\) and then behave as \(S_i\); close end, to close a channel endpoint; and wait end, to wait for the other end of the channel to close. In \(\circ \{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}\) and \& \(\{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I}\), the label set must be non-empty. We will call the session type that describes the behaviour after send, receive, select, or case the \(\text{residual}\).
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Multiplicities

\[ m, n ::= \text{lin} \mid \text{un} \]

Types

\[ T, U ::= \text{unit} \mid S \mid T \to_m U \mid T \times_m U \]

Session types

\[ S, R ::= \! T . S \mid ? T . S \mid \oplus \{ l_i : S_i \}_{i \in I} \mid \& \{ l_i : S_i \}_{i \in I} \mid \text{end}_T \mid \text{end}_? \]

Duality

\[
\begin{align*}
\overline{T \cdot S} &= \overline{? T . S} \quad \& \{ l_i : S_i \}_{i \in I} = \& \{ l_i : S_i \}_{i \in I} \quad \text{end}_T = \text{end}_？ \\
\overline{? T . S} &= \overline{! T . S} \quad \& \{ l_i : S_i \}_{i \in I} = \& \{ l_i : S_i \}_{i \in I} \quad \text{end}_? = \text{end}_T
\end{align*}
\]

Multiplicity ordering

\[ \text{un} < : \text{un} \quad \text{un} < : \text{lin} \quad \text{lin} < : \text{lin} \]

Multiplicity of a type

\[
\begin{align*}
m(T) &= \frac{m(T)}{n^>(T)} \\
\text{un}(\text{unit}) &= \text{lin}(S) \quad m(T \times_m U) \quad m(T \to_m U) \quad m(T) < : n \quad \frac{m(T)}{n^>(T)}
\end{align*}
\]

Subtyping

\[
\begin{align*}
T' < : T & \quad U < : U' \quad m < : n \\
T \to_m U < : T' \to_n U' & \quad T \times_m U < : T' \times_n U' \\
T' < : T \quad S < : S' & \quad \overline{T . S} < : T'. S' \\
\overline{? T . S} < : \overline{? T'. S'} & \quad \overline{\{ l_i : S_i \}_{i \in I}} < : \overline{\{ l_j : R_j \}_{j \in J}} \\
I \subseteq J & \quad (S_i < : R_i)_{i \in I} \quad \& \{ l_i : S_i \}_{i \in I} \subseteq \& \{ l_j : R_j \}_{j \in J} \quad \text{end}_T < : \text{end}_T \quad \text{end}_? < : \text{end}_? \\
\end{align*}
\]

Fig. 1. Types and subtyping in GV.

We define the usual notion of the dual of a session type \( S \), written as \( \overline{S} \). Send is dual to receive, select is dual to case, and close is dual to wait. Duality is an involution, so that \( \overline{\overline{S}} = S \).

Multiplicities are ordered by \( \text{un} < : \text{lin} \), indicating that an unrestricted value may be used where a linear value is expected, but not conversely. The unit type is unrestricted, session types are linear, while function types \( T \to_m U \) and product types \( T \times_m U \) are unrestricted or linear depending on the multiplicity \( m \) that decorates the type constructor. We also write \( n^>(T) \) if \( m(T) \) holds for some \( m \) such that \( m < : n \), thus \( \text{un}^>(T) \) holds only if \( \text{un}(T) \), while \( \text{lin}^>(T) \) holds if either \( \text{lin}(T) \) or \( \text{un}(T) \), and hence holds for any type.

We define subtyping as usual for functional-program like systems (Gay & Vasconcelos, 2010). Function types are contravariant in their domain and covariant in their range, and send types are contravariant in the value sent and covariant in the residual session type. All other types and session types are covariant in all components. Width subtyping resembles record subtyping for select, and variant subtyping for case. That is, on an endpoint where one may select among labels with an index in \( I \) one may instead select among labels with indexes in \( J \), so long as \( J \subseteq I \), while on an endpoint where one must be able to receive any label with an index in \( I \) one may instead receive any label with an index in \( J \), so long as
Names
\[ z ::= x \mid c \]

Expressions
\[ e, f ::= z \mid () \mid \lambda x.e \mid e f \mid (e, f)_m \mid \text{let } x, y = e \text{ in } f \mid \text{fork } e \]
\[ \mid \text{new } \mid \text{send } e f \mid \text{receive } e \mid \text{select } l e \mid \text{case } e \text{ of } \{ (l_i; x_i, e_i) \}_{i \in I} \]
\[ \mid \text{close } e \mid \text{wait } e \]

Processes
\[ P, Q ::= (e) \mid (P | Q) \mid (\nu c, d)P \]

Type environments
\[ \Gamma, \Delta ::= - \mid \Gamma, \gamma: T \]

Environment splitting
\[ \cdot = \circ \]
\[ \Gamma = \Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \quad \text{un}(T) \]
\[ \Gamma, \gamma: T \Rightarrow \gamma: T \quad \Gamma = \Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \quad \text{lin}(T) \]
\[ \Gamma, \gamma: T = (\Gamma_1, \gamma: T) \circ (\Gamma_2, \gamma: T) \quad \Gamma = \Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \quad \text{lin}(T) \]
\[ \Gamma, \gamma: T = (\Gamma_1, \gamma: T) \circ \Gamma_2 \]
\[ \Gamma, \gamma: T = (\Gamma_1, \gamma: T) \circ (\Gamma_2, \gamma: T) \]

Typing expressions
\[ \Gamma \vdash e: T \]
\[ \prooftree \Gamma \vdash x: T \Rightarrow e: U \quad m \Rightarrow (\Gamma) \quad \Gamma \vdash e: T \Rightarrow m U \quad \Gamma \vdash f: T \Rightarrow \in \gamma \Rightarrow \] un\((\Gamma)\)
\[ \Gamma, \gamma: T \Rightarrow \gamma: T \quad \Gamma \vdash \lambda x.e: T \Rightarrow m U \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash e: U \quad \Gamma \vdash \gamma: \gamma: T \Rightarrow \gamma: T \quad \Gamma \vdash e: T \Rightarrow m U \quad \Gamma \vdash f: T \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash \lambda x.e: T \Rightarrow m U \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash e: T \Rightarrow m U \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash f: T \]

Typing processes
\[ \Gamma \vdash e: T \Rightarrow \text{un}(T) \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash (e) \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash \gamma: \gamma: T \Rightarrow \gamma: T \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash e: T \Rightarrow \text{un}(T) \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash e: T \Rightarrow (e) \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash \gamma: \gamma: T \Rightarrow \gamma: T \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash e: T \Rightarrow \text{un}(T) \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash e: T \Rightarrow (e) \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash \gamma: \gamma: T \Rightarrow \gamma: T \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash e: T \Rightarrow \text{un}(T) \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash e: T \Rightarrow (e) \]
\[ \Gamma \vdash \gamma: \gamma: T \Rightarrow \gamma: T \]

Fig. 2. Expressions, processes, and typing in GV.

\[ I \sqsubseteq J. \] (Beware that the subtyping on endpoints is exactly the reverse for process-calculus like systems, such as Wadler’s CP (Wadler, 2012; Wadler, 2014)!

Subtyping is reflexive, transitive, and antisymmetric. Duality inverts subtyping, in that \( S :< R \) if and only if \( R :< S \).

3.1.2 Expressions, processes, and typing

Expressions, processes, and typing for GV are summarised in Figure 2. We let \( x, y \) range over variables, \( c, d \) range over channel endpoints, and \( z \) range over names, which are either variables or channel endpoints.

We let \( e, f \) range over expressions, which include names, unit value, function abstraction and application, pair creation and destruction, fork a process, create a new pair of channel endpoints, send, receive, select, case, close, and wait. Function abstraction and pair creation are labelled with the multiplicity of the value created. We sometimes abbreviate
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Values
\[ v, w ::= () | \lambda x.e | (v, w)_m | c \]

Eval contexts
\[ E, F ::= [] | E e | vE | (E, e)_m | (v, E)_m | \text{let } x, y = E \text{ in } e | \text{send } e \text{ e } | \text{send } vE \]

write
\[ \text{receive } E | \text{select } l E | \text{case } E \text{ of } \{ l_i : x_i \}_i \in I | \text{close } E | \text{wait } E \]

Expression reduction
\[ (\lambda x.e)v \rightarrow e[v/x] \]
\[ \text{let } x, y = (v, w)_m \text{ in } e \rightarrow e[v/x][w/y] \]

Structural congruence
\[ P \equiv Q \]
\[ (\langle v, c \rangle P) \equiv (\langle v, c \rangle) (P \mid Q) \]
\[ (\langle c, d \rangle v) \equiv (\langle c, d \rangle) (P \mid Q) \]
\[ (\langle c, d \rangle) (\langle c, d \rangle) = (\langle c, d \rangle) (\langle c, d \rangle) \]

Process reduction
\[ \langle E[\text{fork } e] \rangle \rightarrow \langle E[\text{fork } e] \rangle | (e) \]
\[ \langle E[\text{new } ] \rangle \rightarrow \langle v, c \rangle \langle E[\text{new }] \rangle \]
\[ \langle v, c \rangle (\langle E[\text{send } v] \rangle | (F[\text{receive } d] \rangle \rightarrow \langle v, c \rangle \langle E[\text{send } v] \rangle | (F[\text{receive } d] \rangle \]
\[ \langle v, c \rangle (\langle E[\text{select } l_j \rangle | (F[\text{case } d \text{ of } \{ l_i : x_i \}_i \in I \}) \rightarrow \langle v, c \rangle \langle E[\text{select } l_j \rangle | (F[\text{case } d \text{ of } \{ l_i : x_i \}_i \in I \}) \]

Let \[ \Gamma; \Delta \] range over environments, which are used for typing. An environment consists of zero or more associations of names with types. Environment splitting \[ \Gamma = \Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \] is standard. It breaks an environment \[ \Gamma \] for an expression or process into environments \[ \Gamma_1 \] and \[ \Gamma_2 \] for its components; a name of unrestricted type may be used in both environments, while a name of linear type must be used in one environment or the other but not both. We write \[ m(\Gamma) \] if \[ m(T) \] holds for each \[ T \] in \[ \Gamma \], and similarly for \[ m^2(\Gamma) \].

Expressions of the form \((\lambda x.e) f\) to let \[ x = e \text{ in } f \], as usual. A GV program is always given as an expression, but as it executes it may fork new processes.

We let \[ P, Q \] range over processes, which include expressions, parallel composition, and a binder that introduces a pair of channel endpoints. The initial process will consist of a single expression, corresponding to a given GV program.

The bindings in the language are as follows: variable \[ x \] is bound in subexpression \[ e \] of \( \lambda x.e \), variables \[ x, y \] are bound in subexpression \[ f \] of let \[ x = e \text{ in } f \], variables \[ x_i \] are are bound in subexpressions \[ e_i \] of case \[ e \text{ of } \{ l_i : x_i \}_i \in I \], channel endpoints \( c, d \) are bound in subexpression \( P \) of \( (v, c, d).P \). The notions of free and bound variables as well that substitution are defined accordingly. We follow Barendregt’s variable convention, whereby all names in binding occurrences in any mathematical context are pairwise distinct and distinct from the free names (Barendregt, 1984).

We let \[ \Gamma; \Delta \] range over environments, which are used for typing. An environment consists of zero or more associations of names with types. Environment splitting \[ \Gamma = \Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \] is standard. It breaks an environment \[ \Gamma \] for an expression or process into environments \[ \Gamma_1 \] and \[ \Gamma_2 \] for its components; a name of unrestricted type may be used in both environments, while a name of linear type must be used in one environment or the other but not both. We write \[ m(\Gamma) \] if \[ m(T) \] holds for each \[ T \] in \[ \Gamma \], and similarly for \[ m^2(\Gamma) \].
Igarashi et al.

Write $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ if under environment $\Gamma$ expression $e$ has type $T$. The typing rules for expressions are standard. In the rules for names, unit, and new the remaining environment must be unrestricted, to enforce the invariant that linear variables are used exactly once. A function abstraction that is unrestricted must have only unrestricted variables bound in its closure, and a pair that is unrestricted may only contain components that are unrestricted. The rules for send, receive, select, case, close, and wait match the corresponding session types. The typing system supports subsumption: if $e$ has type $T$ and $T$ is a subtype of $U$ then $e$ also has type $U$.

Write $\Gamma \vdash P$ if under environment $\Gamma$ process $P$ is well typed. The typing rules for processes are also standard. If expression $e$ has unrestricted type $T$ then process $\langle e \rangle$ is well-typed. If processes $P$ and $Q$ are well-typed, then so is process $P \mid Q$, where the environment of the latter can be split to yield the environments for the former. And if process $P$ is well-typed under an environment that includes channel endpoints $c$ and $d$ with session types $S$ and $T$, then process $(\nu c, d) P$ is well-typed under the same environment without $c$ and $d$.

3.1.3 Reduction

Values, evaluation contexts, reduction for expressions, structural congruence, and reduction for processes for Gradual GV are summarised in Figure 3.

Let $v, w$ range over values, which include unit, function abstractions, pairs of values, and channel endpoints. Let $E, F$ range over evaluation contexts, which are standard.

Write $e \rightarrow f$ to indicate that expression $e$ reduces to expression $f$. Reduction is standard, consisting of beta reduction for functions and pairs.

Write $P \equiv Q$ for structural congruence of processes. It is standard, with composition being commutative and associative. A process returning the unit is the identity of parallel composition, so $P \mid () \equiv P$. The order in which the endpoints are written in a $\nu$-binder is irrelevant. Distinct prefixes commute, and satisfy scope extrusion. The Barendregt convention ensures that $c, d$ are not free in $Q$ in the rule for scope extrusion.

Write $P \rightarrow Q$ if process $P$ reduces to process $Q$. Evaluating $\text{fork } e$ returns $()$ and creates a new process $(e)$. Evaluating $\text{new } int$ introduces a new binder $(\nu c, d)$ and returns a the pair $(c, d)_{\text{lin}}$ of channel endpoints. Evaluating $\text{send } vc$ on one endpoint of a channel and $\text{receive } d$ on the other, causes the send to return $c$ and the receive to return $(v, d)_{\text{lin}}$. Similarly for $\text{select}$ on one endpoint of a channel and case on the other, or close on one endpoint of a channel and wait on the other.

Process reduction is a congruence with regard to parallel composition and binding for channel endpoints, it is closed under structural congruence, and supports expression reduction under evaluation contexts.

3.2 Gradual GV

We now introduce Gradual GV. Following standard frameworks of gradual typing (Siek & Taha, 2006; Siek et al., 2015b), Gradual GV consists of two sublanguages: an external language $\text{GGV}_e$, in which source programs are written, and an internal language $\text{GGV}_i$, to which $\text{GGV}_e$ is elaborated by cast-inserting translation to make necessary run-time checks explicit. The operational semantics of a program is given as reduction of processes
in GGV\textsubscript{e}. We first introduce GGV\textsubscript{c} by outlining its differences to GV (Sections 3.2.1–3.2.3). Next, we introduce the syntax of GGV\textsubscript{e}, which has only expressions, because it is the language in which source programs are written, its type system, and cast-inserting translation from GGV\textsubscript{e} to GGV\textsubscript{c} (Sections 3.2.4–3.2.5). Finally, we discuss how an untyped variant of GV can be embedded into GGV\textsubscript{e} (Section 3.2.6).

### 3.2.1 Types and subtyping

Following the usual approach to gradual types, we extend the grammar of types with a dynamic type (sometimes also called the unknown type), written \(*\). Similarly, we extend session types with the dynamic session type, written \(\odot\). The extended grammar of types is given in Figure 4, where types carried over from Figure 1 are typeset in gray.

As before, we let \(T, U\) range over types and \(S, R\) range over session types. We also distinguish a subset of types which we call ground types, ranged over by \(T, U\), and a subset of session types which we call ground session types, ranged over by \(S, R\), consisting of all the type constructors applied only to arguments which are either the dynamic type or the dynamic session type, as appropriate.

We define \(\odot\) to be self-dual: \(\overline{\odot} = \odot\). We define the multiplicity of the new types by setting \(*\) to be un and \(\odot\) to be lin. The remaining definitions of multiplicity of types carries over unchanged from Figure 1. Type \(*\) is labelled unrestricted although (as we will see below) it corresponds to all possible types, both unrestricted and linear, and therefore
we will need to take special care when handling values of type $\star$ that correspond to values of a linear type. Subtyping is extended trivially by adding reflexivity rules for $\star$ and $\odot$.

Consistent subtyping is defined over types of Gradual GV also in Figure 4. It is identical to the definition of subtyping from Figure 1, with each occurrence of $<: \succeq$ replaced by $\triangleleft: \sqsubseteq$, and with the addition of four rules for the new types

$$
\star \sqsubseteq T \quad T \sqsubseteq \star \quad \odot \sqsubseteq S \quad S \sqsubseteq \odot
$$

For example, we have (a) $\odot \{l_1 : !\star, l_2 : ?\star, \odot\} \sqsubseteq \odot \{l_1 : \odot\}$ and (b) $\& \{l_1 : \odot\} \sqsubseteq \& \{l_1 : !\star, l_2 : ?\star, \odot\}$. Consistent subtyping is reflexive, but neither symmetric nor transitive.

As with subtyping, we have $\overline{S} \sqsubseteq R \iff \overline{R} \sqsubseteq S$. In Gradual GV, we will be permitted to attempt to cast a value of type $T$ to a value of type $U$ exactly when $T \sqsubseteq U$. A cast may fail at runtime: while a cast using (a) will not fail, a cast using (b) may fail because an expression of type $\gamma(\& \{l_1 : \odot\})$ may evaluate to a value of type, say, $\& \{l_1 : \text{end}\}$.

Two types are consistent, written $T \sim U$, if $T \sqsubseteq U$ and $U \sqsubseteq T$. Consistency is reflexive and symmetric but not transitive. The standard example of the failure of transitivity is that for any function type we have $T \rightarrow m U \sim \star$ and for any product type we have $\star \sim T' \times_n U'$, but $T \rightarrow m U \not\sim T' \times_n U'$. In the setting of session types one has for example $?T.S \sim \odot$ and $\odot \sim \text{end}_1$, but $?T.S \not\sim \text{end}_1$.

Subtyping $T <: U$ for Gradual GV essentially carries over from GV. Its definition is exactly as in Figure 1, with the addition of two rules that ensure subtyping is reflexive for the dynamic type and the dynamic session type. In contrast to consistent subtyping, subtyping $T <: U$ guarantees that we may always treat a value of the first type as if it belongs to the second type without casting.
Expressions, processes, and type rules of GGV, are summarised in Figure 5. The expressions of GGV are those of GV, plus an additional form for casts. A cast is written

\[ e : T \xrightarrow{\approx} U \]  

where \( e \) is an expression of type \( T \) and \( p, q \) range over blame labels. Blame labels carry a polarity, which is either positive or negative. The polarity of the blame label of a primary cast in the program before evaluation is positive. A cast redex of the form \( v : T \xrightarrow{\approx} U \) that arises during evaluation can be the result of a sequence of cast reductions applied to a primary cast expression. If the cast raises positive blame, it means that the subject expression surrounded by the primary cast is at fault because it does not return a value of the form requested by its context. Negative blame indicates that the context of the primary cast provided an unsuitable value, e.g., as an argument to the subject. Blame labels switch polarity when traversing the argument position of a function or a send type during reduction. Contravariance accounts for the switch. The complement operation \( p \) performs this switch. Complement is an involution on blame labels, so that \( \overline{\overline{p}} = p \).

In a valid cast, the type \( T \) must be a consistent subtype of \( U \) (\( T \preceq U \)), the type of the entire expression. If a cast in a program fails, it evaluates to blame \( p q X \) or blame \( p X \) (which, as we see later, are treated as processes) where the blame label \( p \) and \( q \) indicate the root cause of the failure (we will explain \( X \) shortly). If the cast in (1) fails, it means that the value returned by \( e \) has type \( T \), but not type \( U \). For example, let \( e = 4711 : \text{int} \xrightarrow{\approx} \ast \), \( T = \ast \), and \( U = \text{bool} \). As \( \ast \preceq \text{bool} \), the resulting expression \( (4711 : \text{int} \xrightarrow{\approx} \ast) : \ast \xrightarrow{\approx} \text{bool} \) is well-typed. However, at runtime it raises blame by reducing to blame \( 4711 : \text{int} \xrightarrow{\approx} \ast \), which flags the error that \text{int} is not a subtype of \text{bool}: that is, \text{int} \not\subset \text{bool}.

Blame is indicated by processes of the form

\[ \text{blame } p q X \quad \text{or} \quad \text{blame } p X \]

where \( p \) and \( q \) are blame labels, and \( X \) is a set of variables of linear type. As we will see, most instances that yield blame involve two casts, hence the form with two blame labels, although blame can arise for a single cast, hence the form with one blame label. The set \( X \) records all linear variables in scope when blame is raised, and is used to maintain the invariant that as a program executes each variable of linear type appears linearly (only once, or once in each branch of a case). Discarding linear variables when raising blame would break the invariant. Blame corresponds to raising an exception, and the list of linear variables corresponds to cleaning up after linear resources when raising an exception (for instance, closing an open file or channel). In the typing rules, the notation \( \text{flv}(\Gamma) \) refers the set of free variables of linear type that appear in \( \Gamma \). We also write \( \text{flv}(E) \) and \( \text{flv}(v) \) for the free linear variables appearing in an evaluation context \( E \) or a value \( v \). In a running program, only free linear variables are channel endpoints, so \( \text{flv}(E) \) and \( \text{flv}(v) \) can be defined without type information.

The processes of GGV, are those of GV, plus three additional forms for linear references (as well as blame, described above). Recall that a value of type \( \ast \) may contain a linear value, in which case dynamic checking must ensure that it is used exactly once. The mechanism for doing so is to allocate a linear reference. We let \( a, b \) range over linear references. A
Values $v, w ::= \cdots \mid v : T \triangleright \star \mid v : S \triangleright \odot \mid v : T \rightarrow_m U \triangleright T' \rightarrow_n U' \mid v : S \triangleright R \mid a$

where un$(T), S \neq \odot, R \neq \odot$

Eval contexts $E, F ::= \cdots \mid E : T \triangleright U$

Expression reduction

| $v : \star \triangleright \star$ | $\rightarrow v$ |
| $v : \odot \triangleright \odot$ | $\rightarrow v$ |
| $v : \text{unit} \triangleright \text{unit}$ | $\rightarrow v$ |
| $(v : T \rightarrow_m U \triangleright T' \rightarrow_n U')w$ | $(v(w : T' \triangleright T)) : U \triangleright U'$ |
| $(v, w)_m : T \times_m U \triangleright T' \times_n U'$ | $(v : T \triangleright T', w : U \triangleright U')_n$ |
| send$(w : \triangleright T, S \triangleright ?T', S')$ | $(\text{send}(v : T' \triangleright T)w) : S \triangleright S'$ |
| receive$(w : ?T, S \triangleright ?T', S')$ | $(\text{receive}(v) : T \times_{\text{lin}} S \triangleright T' \times_{\text{lin}} S')$ |
| $\text{select}_k(w : \oplus \{ i : R_i \}_{i \in I} \triangleright \oplus \{ j : S_j \}_{j \in J})$ | $(\text{select}_k(w) : R_k \triangleright S_k)$ if $k \in J, J \subseteq I$ |
| $\text{case}(w : \{ i : R_i \}_{i \in I} \triangleright \{ j : S_j \}_{j \in J})$ | $\text{case}_{\{ i : x_i \mid \text{let} x_i = (x_i : R_i \triangleright S_i) \text{in} \{ i \}_{i \in I} \mid \text{if} I \subseteq J$ |
| close$(v : \text{end} \triangleright \text{end})$ | $\rightarrow \text{close} v$ |
| wait$(v : \text{end} \triangleright \text{end})$ | $\rightarrow \text{wait} v$ |
| $v : \star \triangleright \star$ | $(v : T \triangleright T) : T \triangleright \star$ if $T \neq \star, T \neq T, T \sim T$ |
| $v : \star \triangleright T$ | $(v : x \triangleright T) : T \triangleright \star$ if $T \neq \star, T \neq T, T \sim T$ |
| $v : S \triangleright \odot$ | $(v : S \triangleright S) : S \triangleright \odot$ if $S \neq \odot, S \neq S, S \sim S$ |
| $v : \odot \triangleright S$ | $(v : \odot \triangleright S) : S \triangleright \odot$ if $S \neq \odot, S \neq S, S \sim S$ |

Fig. 6. Reduction in GGVt expressions.

Linear reference is of type $\star$, and contains a value $w$ of ground type $T$, where $T$ is linear (either $\star \rightarrow_{\text{lin}} \star$ or $\star \times_{\text{lin}} \star$ or the dynamic session type $\odot$). Linear references are governed by two binding forms

$$(\forall a \mapsto w : T \triangleright \star)P \quad \text{or} \quad (\forall a \mapsto \text{locked} P)P$$

where $w$ is a value of type $T$, $p$ is a blame label, and $P$ is a process which may refer to $a$. Bindings for linear references initially take the first form, but change to the second form after the linear reference has been accessed once; any subsequent attempt to access the reference a second time will cause an error.

3.2.3 Reduction

Values, evaluation contexts, reductions for expressions, structural congruence, and reductions for processes for GGVt are summarised in Figures 6 and 7.

The values of GGVt are those of GV, plus five additional forms. Values of dynamic type either have the form $v : T \triangleright \star$ as in other blame calculi, if $T$ is unrestricted, or a linear reference $a$, if the dynamic type wraps a linear value. Additionally, there are values of dynamic session type which take the form $v : S \triangleright \odot$.

Following standard practice for blame calculus, we take a cast of a value between function types to be a value, and for similar reasons a cast from a session type to a session
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Structural congruence

\[(va \mapsto \omega) P \equiv (va \mapsto \omega)(P \equiv Q)\]

\[(va \mapsto \omega)\langle vb \mapsto \omega' \rangle P \equiv (vb \mapsto \omega')(va \mapsto \omega)P\]

\[(vc, d)\langle va \mapsto \omega \rangle P \equiv (va \mapsto \omega)(vc, d)P\]

\[(va \mapsto \text{locked})\langle () \rangle \equiv \langle () \rangle\]

Process reduction

\[\langle E[v : T \overset{P}{\rightarrow} *] \rangle \rightarrow \langle va \mapsto w : T \overset{P}{\rightarrow} *(E[u]) \rangle\]

if \(\text{lin}(T)\) and \(E \neq F[i] : \star \overset{P}{\rightarrow} U\]

\[\langle va \mapsto w : T \overset{P}{\rightarrow} *(E[u] : \star \overset{P}{\rightarrow} U) \rangle \rightarrow \langle va \mapsto \text{locked} P \rangle\langle E[w : T \overset{P}{\rightarrow} *] : \star \overset{P}{\rightarrow} U \rangle \rightarrow \langle Q \rangle\]

\[\langle va \mapsto \text{locked} P \rangle\langle E[a] : \star \overset{P}{\rightarrow} U \rangle \rightarrow \langle va \mapsto \text{locked} P \rangle\langle E[a] : \star \overset{P}{\rightarrow} U \rangle \rightarrow \langle Q \rangle\]

\[\langle va \mapsto w : T \overset{P}{\rightarrow} *(E[u]) \rangle \rightarrow \text{blame} P\langle E[w] \rangle\]

\[\langle E[v : T \overset{P}{\rightarrow} *] : \star \overset{P}{\rightarrow} U \rangle \rightarrow \langle E[v] \rangle\]

if \(T <: U\)

\[\langle E[v : T \overset{P}{\rightarrow} *] : \star \overset{P}{\rightarrow} U \rangle \rightarrow \text{blame} P\langle E[v] \rangle\]

if \(T \not<: U\)

\[\langle E[v : S \overset{P}{\rightarrow} Q] : \star \overset{P}{\rightarrow} R \rangle \rightarrow \langle E[v] \rangle\]

if \(S \not<: R\)

\[\langle E[v : S \overset{P}{\rightarrow} Q] : \star \overset{P}{\rightarrow} R \rangle \rightarrow \text{blame} P\langle E[v] \rangle\]

if \(S \not\triangleleft: R\)

\[\langle (vc, d)(E[c] : \star \overset{P}{\rightarrow} S) \rangle \rightarrow \langle F[d] : \star \overset{P}{\rightarrow} R \rangle \rightarrow \langle vc, d \rangle\langle E[c] \rangle \rightarrow \langle F[d] \rangle\]

if \(S \not<: R\)

\[\langle (vc, d)(E[c] : \star \overset{P}{\rightarrow} S) \rangle \rightarrow \text{blame} P\langle E[v] \rangle\]

if \(S \not\triangleleft: R\)

\[P \rightarrow Q \rightarrow (va \mapsto \omega)Q\]

Fig. 7. Reduction in GGVi, processes.

type is a value unless one end of the cast is the dynamic session type:

\[v : T \rightarrow_m U \overset{P}{\rightarrow} T' \rightarrow_n U' \quad \text{or} \quad v : S \overset{P}{\rightarrow} R\]

where \(S, R \not\triangleleft: \odot\).

Additional reductions for expressions appear in Figure 6. Typical of blame calculus is the reduction for a cast between function types, often called the wrap rule:

\[(v : T \rightarrow_m U \overset{P}{\rightarrow} T' \rightarrow_n U') \rightarrow (v(w : T' \overset{P}{\rightarrow} T)) \rightarrow (v(w : T' \overset{P}{\rightarrow} T)) : U \overset{P}{\rightarrow} U'\]

The cast on the function decomposes into two casts, one on the domain and one on the range. The fact that subtyping (and consistent subtyping) for function types is contravariant on the domain and covariant on the range is reflected in the fact that the cast on the domain is from \(T'\) to \(T\) and complements the blame label \(\bar{\pi}\), while the cast on the range is form \(U\) to \(U'\) and leaves the blame label \(\pi\) unchanged. Casts for products follow a similar pattern, though covariant on all components.

Reductions on session types follow the pattern of the reduction for a cast between send types:

\[\text{send}_v(w : 1T. S \overset{P}{\rightarrow} 1T'. S') \rightarrow (\text{send}(v : T' \overset{P}{\rightarrow} T)w) : S \overset{P}{\rightarrow} S'\]

The cast on the send decomposes into two casts, one on the value sent and one on the residual session type. The fact that subtyping (and consistent subtyping) for send types is contravariant on the value sent and covariant on the residual session type is reflected in the fact that the cast on the value sent is from \(T'\) to \(T\) and complements the blame label \(\bar{\pi}\), while the cast on the residual session type is from \(S\) to \(S'\) and leaves the blame label
unchanged. The casts for the remaining session types follow a similar pattern, though covariant on all components.

Also typical of blame calculus, casts to the dynamic type factor through a ground type, $v: T \triangleright \star \rightarrow (v: T \triangleright \star): T \triangleright \star$

when $T \neq \star$, $T \neq T$, and $T \sim T$. This factoring is unique because for every type $T$ such that $T \neq \star$ there is a unique ground type $T$ such that $T \sim T$. The additional condition $T \neq T$ ensures that the factoring is non-trivial and that reduction does not enter a loop. Casts from the dynamic type, and casts to and from the dynamic session type are handled analogously.

Additional structural congruences and reductions for expressions appear in Figure 7. Like bindings for channel endpoints, bindings for linear references satisfy scope extrusion and reduction is a congruence with respect to them. Note that it is not possible to commute $(\nu a \mapsto \rightarrow w: T \triangleright \star)$ with other $\nu$-binders if an outer $\nu$ binds free variables in $w$.

The first four reduction rules for processes deal with linear references, ensuring that a value cast from a linear type to a dynamic type is accessed exactly once. As the only values of the dynamic type are casts from a ground type, expressions of interest take the form $w: T \triangleright \star$ where $w$ is a value and $T$ is a linear ground type. The first rule introduces a linear reference, represented as a binding of the form $(\nu a \mapsto \rightarrow w: T \triangleright \star)P$ where $P$ contains all uses of $a$, a freshly introduced name. The context restriction ensures that a linear reference is only introduced if the value is not immediately accessed. Any attempt to access the linear reference $a$ must take the form $E[a: \star \triangleright \star]$ where $E$ is an evaluation context and $U$ is a ground type that may or may not be linear. The second rule implements the first access to a linear value by copying the value $v$ in place of the linear reference $a$, and updating the binding to $(\nu a \mapsto \rightarrow \text{locked} p)$, indicating that the linear reference has been accessed once. The third rule implements any subsequent attempt to access a linear value, which allocates blame to both of the casts involved, negative blame $p$ for the inner cast and positive blame $q$ for the outer cast, indicating that in both cases blame is allocated to the side of the cast of type $\star$. The blame term also contains $flv(E)$, the set of free linear variables that appear in the context $E$, which as mentioned earlier is required to maintain the invariant on linear variables; all occurrences of blame contain corresponding sets of linear variables, which we will not mention further. The final rule indicates what happens when all processes containing the unlocked linear reference finish execution. If the reference is not locked then it was never accessed, and blame should be allocated to the context of the original cast, which discarded the value rather than using it linearly. The case where the reference is locked is represented in the last structural congruence rule, which expresses deallocation of the reference. In practice, these rules would be implemented as part of garbage collection.
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The remaining six rules come in three pairs. Typical of blame calculus is the first pair, often called the collapse and collide rules:

\[
\langle E[v]: T \xrightarrow{\nu} \ast, U \rangle \rightarrow \langle E[v] \rangle \quad \text{if } T <: U
\]
\[
\langle E[v]: T \xrightarrow{\nu} \ast, U \rangle \rightarrow \text{blame} \mathcal{P} q (\text{flv}(E) \cup \text{flv}(v)) \quad \text{if } T \not\subseteq U
\]

If the source type is a subtype of the target type, the casts collapse to the original value. Types are preserved by subsumption: since \( v \) has type \( T \) and \( T <: U \) then \( v \) also has type \( U \). Conversely, if the source type is not a subtype of the target type, then the casts are in collision and reduce to blame. Blame is allocated to both of the casts involved, negative blame \( \mathcal{P} \) for the inner cast and positive blame \( q \) for the outer cast, indicating that in both cases blame is allocated to the side of the cast of type \( \ast \). Our choice to allocate blame to both casts differs from the usual formulation of blame calculus, which only allocates blame to the outer cast. Allocating blame to only the outer cast is convenient if one wishes to implement blame calculus by erasure to a dynamically typed language, where injection of a value to the dynamic type is represented by the value itself, that is, the erasure of \( v \) itself. However, this asymmetric implementation is less appropriate in our situation. For session types, a symmetric formulation is more appropriate, as we will see shortly when we look at the interaction between casts and communication.

The next pair of rules transpose collapse and collide from types to session types. The final pair of rules adapt collapse and collide to the case of communication between two channel endpoints. Here is the adapted collapse rule.

\[
\langle v, c \rangle (\langle E[c]: S \xrightarrow{\nu} R \rangle | \langle F[d]: S \xrightarrow{\nu} R \rangle) \rightarrow \langle v, d \rangle (\langle E[c] \rangle | \langle F[d] \rangle) \quad \text{if } S <: R
\]

The condition on this rule is symmetric, since \( S <: R \) if and only if \( R <: S \). On the left-hand side of this rule \( c, d \) both have session type \( \nu \), while on the right-hand side of the rule \( c, d \) have session types \( S, S \) or \( R, R \). Again, types are preserved by subsumption, since if \( c, d \) have session types \( S, S \) and \( S <: R \) then \( c, d \) also have session types \( S, R \), and similarly if \( c, d \) have session types \( R, R \). Analogously, the last rule adapts collide.

An alternative design might replace the final pair of rules by a structural congruence that slides a cast from one endpoint of a channel to the other:

\[
\langle v, c \rangle (E[c]: S \xrightarrow{\nu} R | F[d]) \equiv \langle v, d \rangle (E[c] | F[d]: R \xrightarrow{\nu} S).
\]

Setting \( S \) to \( \nu \) and \( R \) to \( S \), this congruence can reduce the third collapse rule (on channel endpoints) to the second collapse rule (on a nested pair of casts on session types). However, even with this congruence the two collide rules are not quite equivalent. Our chosen formulation, though slightly longer, is more symmetric and easier to implement.

3.2.4 External language \( GGV_e \)

Having defined the internal language, we introduce the external language \( GGV_e \), in which source programs are written. The syntax of expressions of \( GGV_e \) is presented in Figure 8. For ease of typechecking, variable declarations in functions and channel endpoint creations are explicitly typed. There are no processes in \( GGV_e \); a program is a well-typed closed expression and it is translated to a \( GGV \) expression before it runs.
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Fig. 8. Expressions in GGVE.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Matching} & \quad T \bowtie U \\
\text{Subtyping} & \quad \vdash T \rightarrow_m U \quad \vdash T \times_m U \\
\text{Internal} & \quad \vdash !T.S \\
\text{External} & \quad \vdash ?T.S \\
\text{Union} & \quad \vdash \{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I} \bowtie \{l_j : S_j\} \\
\text{Intersection} & \quad \vdash \{l_i : S_i\}_{i \in I} \& \{l_j : S_j\}_{j \in J} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The type system of GGVE adheres to standard practice for gradually typed languages (Siek et al., 2015b; Cimini & Siek, 2016), but requires a few adaptations to cater for features not covered in previous work. We first introduce a few auxiliary definitions used in typing rules. Figure 9 defines the matching relation \( T \bowtie U \) (Cimini & Siek, 2016). Roughly speaking, \( T \bowtie U \) means that \( T \) can be used, after run-time checking, as \( U \). The second and third columns declare that, if \( T \) is \( \ast \) or \( \oplus \), then it can be used as any type or session type, respectively. Otherwise, the matching relation extracts substructure, i.e., the domain type, the codomain type, the first-element type, and so on, from \( T \). So, we have neither \( \ast \bowtie \) unit nor \( \oplus \bowtie \) end, or \( \oplus \bowtie \) end.

Matching for the internal and external choice types is slightly involved as it has to cater for subtyping. Matching for internal choice is invoked in the type rule for an expression select \( e \). Thanks to subtyping, the type of \( e \) can be any internal choice with a branch for label \( l \). Hence, matching only asks for the presence of this single label and extracts its continuation type.

Dually, matching for external choice is invoked in the rule for a case \( e \ldots \). Again due to subtyping, the case expression can check more labels than provided by the type of \( e \). Hence, matching allows for extra branches to be checked with arbitrary continuation types \( (l_j : S_j \text{ in the definition}) \) while extracting the continuation types for all branches provided by \( e \).

Obtaining the result type of a case expression from the types of its branches requires a join operation \( T \lor U \) that ensures that its result is (in a certain sense) a supertype of both \( T \) and \( U \). Figure 10 contains the definitions of join and its companion meet, which is needed in contravariant positions of the type. Both operations are partial: join or meet is undefined for cases other than those listed in Figure 10.

Join of two \( \oplus \)-types can be obtained by taking the joins of the types associated with common labels. Note that labels where the joins \( S_i \lor R_i \) do not exist will be dropped. On the other hand, the label set of the join of two \&-types is the union of the two label sets.
from the input. For the common labels in $I \cap J$, the joins $S_k \lor R_i$ must exist. Join or meet is undefined if the resulting type is $\oplus\{\}$ or $\&\{}$ (with the empty set of labels) as they are ill-formed types.

Moreover, in Figure 11, we define the corresponding ordering relation, which we call *polarised consistent subtyping*. This relation is a partial order that lies properly between
Polarised consistent subtyping

\[ T \subseteq^\oplus U \quad T \subseteq^\otimes U \]

Polarities \( u \) range over \( \oplus, \otimes \) complemented by the flip operation: \( \otimes = \ominus \) and \( \oplus = \ominus \)

\[ \begin{align*}
T & \subseteq^u T' \quad T' \subseteq^u U \quad m : n & \frac{(T \triangleleft m U) \subseteq^u (T' \triangleleft n U')}{(T \rightarrow_m U) \subseteq^u (T' \rightarrow_n U')} \\
\ominus & \subseteq^\oplus R \quad S \subseteq^\otimes S' \quad \text{end}_1 \subseteq^u \text{end}_1 \quad \text{end}_7 \subseteq^u \text{end}_7
\end{align*} \]

Two examples demonstrate that neither subtyping nor consistent subtyping are suitable for defining a join operation. Consider a case expression where one branch has type \( \otimes \) and the other has type int. The resulting join type should be int. Standard subtyping for \( \Gamma \)
cannot be used since \( \star \not<: \text{int} \), whereas consistent subtyping can: \( \star \leq: \text{int} \). To argue against consistent subtyping, consider one branch returning type \( \text{int} \) and the other returning \( \text{bool} \). Joining with consistent subtyping would resolve this conflict to \( \star \) (as \( \text{int} \leq \star \) and \( \text{bool} \leq \star \)), but the static embedding property of the Criteria for Gradual Typing (Siek et al., 2015b) dictates that the join of \( \text{int} \) and \( \text{bool} \) should not be defined. As consistent subtyping is not an order relation (it is not transitive), it is no surprise that no good join operation can be defined on top of it.

Typing rules are presented in Figure 12. The matching relation is used in elimination rules. To obtain a syntax-directed inference system, the subsumption is merged into function application, sending, select, and case. Moreover, subtyping is replaced with consistent subtyping. The type of the whole case expression is obtained by joining the types of the branches. Finally, the judgment \( \text{prog} \) means that \( \epsilon \) is a Gradual GV program, which is a closed, well-typed GGV expression of unrestricted type. Cast insertion translates a program to a GGV expression \( \epsilon \), which runs as a process \( \langle \epsilon \rangle \).

We also develop a typechecking algorithm for GGV by following the standard approach (Kobayashi et al., 1999; Walker, 2005). We define an algorithm CHECKEXPR(\( \Gamma, \epsilon \)), which takes a type environment \( \Gamma \) and an expression \( \epsilon \) and returns a type \( T \) of \( \epsilon \) and the set \( X \) of linear variables in \( \epsilon \). We avoid nondeterminism involved in environment splitting by introducing \( X \), which is used to check whether subexpressions do not use the same (linear) variable more than once. We present the algorithm in full and prove its correctness in Appendix A. In particular, the algorithm is shown to compute, for given \( \Gamma \) and \( \epsilon \), a minimal type with respect to polarised consistent subtyping (if a typing exists).

### 3.2.5 Cast-inserting translation

A well-typed GGV expression is translated to a GGV expression by dropping type annotations and inserting casts. Figure 13 presents cast insertion. The judgment \( \Gamma \vdash \epsilon \rightarrow f: T \) means that “under type environment \( \Gamma \), a GGV expression \( \epsilon \) is translated to a GGV expression \( f \) at type \( T \).” Most rules are straightforward: casts are inserted where the matching or consistent subtyping is used. In each rule, blame label \( p \) is supposed to be fresh and positive. The notation \( f : T \overset{p}{\rightarrow} U \) is used to avoid inserting unnecessary casts.

\[
f : T \overset{p}{\rightarrow} U = \begin{cases} f & \text{if } T \ll: U \\ f : T \overset{p}{\Rightarrow} U & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\]

Thanks to this optimisation, we can show that a program that does not use \( \star \) or \( \odot \) is translated to a cast-free GGV expression, whose behaviour obviously coincides with GV.

### 3.2.6 Embedding

One desideratum for a gradual typing system is that it is possible to embed an untyped (or rather, unityped) language within it (Siek et al., 2015b). An embedding of an untyped variant of GV into GGV is given in Figure 14. Blame labels are omitted; each cast should receive a unique blame label. The untyped variant has the same syntax as the expressions of GV, but every expression has type \( \star \). The embedding extends that of (Wadler & Findler, 2009) for the untyped lambda calculus into the blame calculus.
By induction on $\Gamma$

Proof

Lemma 1 (Weakening)

If $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ and $\text{un}(U)$, then $\Gamma, x : U \vdash e : T$.

Proof

By induction on $\Gamma \vdash e : T$.

Lemma 2 (Strengthening)

If $\Gamma, x : U \vdash e : T$ and $x$ does not occur free in $e$, then $\Gamma \vdash e : T$.

Proof

By induction on $\Gamma, x : U \vdash e : T$.  

4 Results

Proofs in this section are for Gradual GV described in Section 3.2. Proofs for GV of Section 3.1 are similar to those for GGV, except that they do not mention casts and blame, which are specific to GGV.

4.1 Preservation and Progress for GGV

We show preservation and absence of run-time errors for GGV. The basic structure of the proof follows Gay and Vasconcelos (2010).

Lemma 1 (Weakening)

If $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ and $\text{un}(U)$, then $\Gamma, x : U \vdash e : T$.

Proof

By induction on $\Gamma \vdash e : T$.

Lemma 2 (Strengthening)

If $\Gamma, x : U \vdash e : T$ and $x$ does not occur free in $e$, then $\Gamma \vdash e : T$.

Proof

By induction on $\Gamma, x : U \vdash e : T$.  

Fig. 13. Cast insertion.
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\[
\begin{align*}
[x] &= x \\
[()] &= () : \text{unit} \Rightarrow \\
[\lambda x.e] &= (\lambda_{un}x,[e]) : \ast \rightarrow_{un} \ast \Rightarrow \\
[(e,f)] &= ([e],[f])_{un} : \ast \times_{un} \ast \Rightarrow \\
[e,f] &= ([e] : \ast \Rightarrow \ast \rightarrow_{\text{fin}} \ast) [f]
\end{align*}
\]
\[\begin{align*}
[\text{let} \, x,y = e \, \text{in} \, f] &= \text{let} \, x,y = ([e] : \ast \Rightarrow \ast \times_{\text{fin}} \ast) \text{in} \, [f] \\
[\text{fork} \, e] &= (\text{fork}([e] : \ast \Rightarrow \text{unit})) : \text{unit} \Rightarrow \ast \\
[\text{new}] &= \text{new} : \odot \times_{\text{fin}} \odot \Rightarrow \ast \\
[\text{send} \, e \, f] &= (\text{send}([e])([f] : \ast \Rightarrow \! \ast \times \odot)) : \odot \Rightarrow \ast \\
[\text{receive} \, e] &= (\text{receive}([e] : \ast \Rightarrow ? \times \odot)) : \ast \times_{\text{fin}} \odot \Rightarrow \ast \\
[\text{select} \, e \, f] &= (\text{select}(l([e] : \ast \Rightarrow \odot \times \odot)) : \odot \Rightarrow \ast \\
[\text{case} \, \text{of} \, \{l_1 : \eta_1, e_1 \}_{i \in I}] &= \text{case}([e] : \ast \Rightarrow ? \odot) \text{of} \, \{l_i : \eta_i, \text{let} \, x_i = (y_i : \odot \Rightarrow \ast) \text{in} \, [e_i] \}_{i \in I} \\
[\text{close} \, e] &= (\text{close}([e] : \ast \Rightarrow \text{end}) : \text{unit} \Rightarrow \ast \\
[\text{wait} \, e] &= (\text{wait}([e] : \ast \Rightarrow \text{end})) : \text{unit} \Rightarrow \ast
\end{align*}\]

Fig. 14. Embedding of the untyped calculus.

Lemma 3 (Preservation for \(\equiv\))

If \(P \equiv Q\), then \(\Gamma \vdash P\) if and only if \(\Gamma \vdash Q\).

Proof

By induction on \(P \equiv Q\). Use Lemmas 1, 2, and basic properties of context splitting (Vasconcelos, 2012; Walker, 2005) for the scope extrusion rules. \(\square\)

Lemma 4

If \(\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \land \text{un} (\Gamma_1)\), then \(\Gamma = \Gamma_2\).

Proof

By induction on \(\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2\). \(\square\)

Lemma 5

If \(\Gamma \vdash v : T\) and \(\text{un} (T)\), then \(\text{un} (\Gamma)\).

Proof

By case analysis on the last rule used to derive \(\Gamma \vdash v : T\). \(\square\)

Lemma 6 (Substitution)

If \(\Gamma_1 \vdash v : U\) and \(\Gamma_2, x : U \vdash e : T\) and \(\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2\), then \(\Gamma \vdash e[v/x] : T\).

Proof

By induction on \(\Gamma_2, x : U \vdash e : T\) with case analysis on the last derivation rule used. We show main cases below.

Case (variables): If \(e = x\) and \(T = U\) and \(\text{un} (\Gamma_2)\), then we have, by Lemma 4, \(\Gamma = \Gamma_1\), finishing the case. If \(e \neq x\), then Lemma 2 finishes the case.

Case (applications): We have \(e = e_1 e_2\) and \(\Gamma_1, e_1 : T_2, e_2 : T_2, \Gamma_2 \vdash e : T\) and \(\Gamma_1, x : U = \Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2\). We have two subcases depending on whether \(\text{un} (U)\) or not.
Subcase $\text{un}(U)$: We have $\Gamma_{11} = \Gamma'_{11}, x : U$ and $\Gamma_{12} = \Gamma'_{12}, x : U$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma'_{11} \circ \Gamma'_{12}$. The induction hypothesis give us $\Gamma'_{11} \circ \Gamma_{2} \vdash e_{1}[v/x] : T_{2} \rightarrow_{m} T$ and $\Gamma'_{12} \circ \Gamma_{2} \vdash e_{2}[v/x] : T_{2}$. By Lemma 5, we have $\text{un}(\Gamma_{2})$. The typing rule for applications shows $(\Gamma'_{11} \circ \Gamma_{2}) \circ (\Gamma'_{12} \circ \Gamma_{2}) \vdash (e_{1} e_{2})[v/x] : T$. Lemma 4 finishes the subcase.

Subcase $\text{lin}(U)$: either (1) $\Gamma_{11} = \Gamma'_{11}$ and $\Gamma_{12} = \Gamma'_{12}$, in which case we have $\Gamma'_{12} \vdash e_{2}[v/x] : U$ by the induction hypothesis and also $e_{1}[v/x] = e_{1}$ and the typing rule for applications finishes; or (2) $\Gamma_{11} = \Gamma'_{11}, x : U$ and $\Gamma_{12} = \Gamma'_{12}$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma'_{11} \circ \Gamma'_{12}$, in which case the conclusion is similarly proved.

The following two lemmas are adapted from earlier work (Gay & Vasconcelos, 2010).

Lemma 7 (Sub-derivation introduction)
If $\mathcal{D}$ is a derivation of $\Gamma \vdash E[e] : T$, then there exist $\Gamma_{1}, \Gamma_{2}$ and $U$ such that $\Gamma = \Gamma_{1} \circ \Gamma_{2}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ has a sub-derivation $\mathcal{D}'$ concluding $\Gamma_{2} \vdash e : U$ and the position of $\mathcal{D}'$ in $\mathcal{D}$ corresponds to the position of the hole in $E$.

Proof
By induction on $E$.

Lemma 8 (Sub-derivation elimination)
$\Gamma \vdash E[f] : T$ holds, if

- $\mathcal{D}$ is a derivation of $\Gamma_{1} \circ \Gamma_{2} \vdash E[e] : T$,
- $\mathcal{D}'$ is a sub-derivation of $\mathcal{D}$ concluding $\Gamma_{2} \vdash e : U$,
- the position of $\mathcal{D}'$ in $\mathcal{D}$ corresponds to the position of the hole in $E$,
- $\Gamma_{3} \vdash f : U$, and
- $\Gamma = \Gamma_{1} \circ \Gamma_{3}$.

Proof
By induction on $E$.

Lemma 9
If $\Gamma \vdash e : T$, then $\text{flv}(\Gamma) = \text{flv}(e)$.

Proof
Easy induction on $\Gamma \vdash e : T$.

Theorem 1 (Preservation for expressions)
If $e \rightarrow f$ and $\Gamma \vdash e : T$, then $\Gamma \vdash f : T$.

Proof
By rule induction on the first hypothesis. For $\beta$-reduction and let we use the substitution lemma (Lemma 6), using an ‘inversion of the typing relation’ lemma which we omit.

Theorem 2 (Preservation for processes)
If $P \rightarrow Q$ and $\Gamma \vdash P$, then $\Gamma \vdash Q$.

Proof
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By rule induction on the first hypothesis, using basic properties of context splitting (Vasconcelos, 2012; Walker, 2005) and weakening (Lemma 1). Rules that make use of context use subderivation introduction (Lemma 7) to build the derivation for the hypothesis, and subderivation elimination (Lemma 8) to build the derivation for the conclusion. Rules for reduction to blame use Lemma 9. Reduction underneath parallel composition and scope restriction follow by induction. The rule for $\equiv$ uses Lemma 3. Closure under evaluation contexts uses Theorem 1.

Lemma 10 (Ground types, subtyping, and consistent subtyping)

1. If $T \neq \ast$, there is a unique ground type $T$ such that $T \sim T$.
2. If $S \neq \otimes$, there is a unique ground session type $S$ such that $S \sim S$.
3. $T \leq U$ iff $T \lessdot U$.
4. $S \leq R$ iff $S \lessdot R$.

Lemma 11 (Canonical forms)

Suppose that $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ where $\Gamma$ contains session types and $\ast$, only.

1. If $T = \ast$, then either $e = w : T \overset{p}{\Rightarrow} \ast$ with un($T$) or $v = a$.
2. If $T = \otimes$, then either $e = c$ or $e = w : S \overset{p}{\Rightarrow} \otimes$ and $S = \otimes$ or $v = w : R_{1} \overset{p}{\Rightarrow} R_{2}$ with $R_{2} \lessdot S$.
3. If $T = \text{unit}$, then $v = ()$.
4. If $T = U_{1} \rightarrow_{m} U_{2}$, then either $e = \lambda_{m}x.e$ with $n < : m$ or $v = w : T_{1} \rightarrow_{n_{1}} T_{2} \overset{p}{\Rightarrow} U'_{1} \rightarrow_{n_{2}} U'_{2}$ with $n_{2} < : m$ and $U_{1} < : U'_{1}$ and $U'_{2} < : U_{2}$.
5. If $T = T_{1} \times_{m} T_{2}$, then $v = (w_{1}, w_{2})_{m}$ with $n < : m$.

Theorem 3 (Progress for expressions)

Suppose that $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ and that $\Gamma$ only contains channel endpoints and linear references. Then exactly one of the following cases holds.

1. $e$ is a value,
2. $e \rightarrow f$ (as an expression),
3. $e = E[f]$ and $f$ is a GV operation: fork $f'$, new, send $v c$, receive $c$, select $l c$, case $c$ of $\{ i_{i} : x_{i}, e_{i} \}$, close $c$, or wait $c$,
4. $e = E[f]$ and $f$ is a Gradual GV operation:
   - $w : T \overset{p}{\Rightarrow} \ast$, with lin($T$),
   - $a : \ast \overset{q}{\Rightarrow} U$,
   - $(v : T \overset{p}{\Rightarrow} \ast) : \ast \overset{q}{\Rightarrow} U$, with un($T$),
   - $(v : S \overset{p}{\Rightarrow} \otimes) : \otimes \overset{q}{\Rightarrow} R$, or
   - $c : \otimes \overset{p}{\Rightarrow} S$.

Proof

By induction on expressions, using Canonical forms (Lemma 11).

The notion of run-time errors helps us state our type safety result. The subject of an expression $e$, denoted by subj$(e)$, is $c$ when $e$ falls into one of the following cases and undefined in all other cases.

send $f c$ receive $c$ select $l c$ case $c$ of $\{ i_{i} : x_{i}, f_{i} \} \in I$ close $c$ wait $c$

Two expressions $e$ and $f$ agree on a channel with ends in set $\{ c, d \}$ where $c \neq d$, denoted agree$^{\{ c, d \}}(e, f)$, a relation on two two-element sets, in the following cases.
1. agree\[c,d\] \{ send\[c, received\[d\]\};
2. agree\[c,d\] \{ select\[j \in I\] \{ i : x_i \}} \{ i \in I \}
3. agree\[c,d\] \{ close\[c, wait\[d\]\].

A process is an error if it is structurally congruent to some process that contains a subprocess of one of the following forms.

1. \{E[ve]\} and v is not an abstraction;
2. \{E[let\ a,b = v in e]\} and v is not a pair;
3. \{E[e]\} \{ F[f]\} and subj(e) = subj(f);
4. (vc,d)((\{E[e]\} \{ F[f]\}) and subj(e) = c and subj(f) = d and not agree\[c,d\]\{e,f\}.

The first two cases are typical of functional languages. The third case ensures no two threads hold references to the same channel endpoint. The fourth case ensures channel endpoints agree at all times: if one process is ready to send then the other is ready to receive, and similarly for select and case, close and wait.

For processes, rather than a progress result, we present a type safety result as our type system does not rule out deadlocks, though we do not open new chances for deadlocks when compared to GV (Gay & Vasconcelos, 2010). Our result holds both for GV and Gradual GV alike.

**Theorem 4 (Absence of run-time errors)**

Let \(\Gamma \vdash P\) where \(\Gamma\) does not contain function or pair types, and let \(P \rightarrow^* Q\). Then \(Q\) is not an error.

**Proof**

By induction on the length of reduction steps \(P \rightarrow^* Q\). For the base case, where \(P = Q\), we show \(P\) is not an error by showing all error processes cannot be well typed.

All cases use Lemma 7 and inversion of the typing relation (omitted). The cases for application and let follow from the fact that \(\Gamma\) does not contain function or pair types. The third case follows from the fact that \(c\), being the subject of expressions, is of a linear type, hence cannot occur in two distinct processes. The fourth case follows from the fact that typability implies that \(c\) and \(d\) are of dual types, which in turn implies agree\[c,d\]\{e,f\}.

### 4.2 Blame Safety

Following Wadler and Findler (2009) we introduce three new subtyping relations: \(<+\), \(<-\), and \(<n\), called positive, negative, and naive subtyping respectively, in addition to the ordinary subtyping \(<\) defined in Figure 4.

A cast from \(T\) to \(U\) with label \(p\) may either return a value or may raise blame \(p\) (called positive blame) or blame \(\neg p\) (called negative blame). The original subtyping relation \(T <: U\) of GGV characterises when a cast from \(T\) to \(U\) never yields blame; relations \(T <:+ U\) and \(T <:- U\) characterise when a cast from \(T\) to \(U\) cannot yield positive or negative blame, respectively; and relation \(T <: n U\) characterises when type \(T\) is more precise (in the sense of being less dynamic) than type \(U\). All four relations are reflexive and transitive, and subtyping, positive subtyping, and naive subtyping are antisymmetric.
Gradual Session Types

Positive and negative subtyping

\[ T <^+ * \quad S <^+ \circ \quad * <^\circ T \quad \circ <^\circ S \]

\[ \text{unit} <^\circ \text{unit} \]

\[ T' <^\circ T \quad T <^\circ \text{unit} \quad U <^\circ U' \quad m <^\circ n \]

\[ \frac{T \times_m U <^\circ T' \times_m U'}{T \times_m U <^\circ T' \times_m U'} \]

\[ T' \times^\circ T \quad S <^\circ S' \quad T \times^\circ T' \quad S <^\circ S' \quad T' \times S <^\circ T' \times S' \]

\[ \text{if and only if} \quad (S_k <^\circ R_k)_{k \in J} \]

\[ \text{and} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \{l_j : S_l\}_{l \in J} <^\circ \oplus \{l_j : R_j\}_{l \in J} \]

\[ J \subseteq I \quad (S_j <^\circ R_j)_{j \in J} \quad \oplus \{l_j : S_l\}_{l \in J} <^\circ \oplus \{l_j : R_j\}_{l \in J} \]

\[ I \subseteq J \quad (S_i <^\circ R_i)_{i \in I} \quad \oplus \{l_j : S_l\}_{l \in I} <^\circ \oplus \{l_j : R_j\}_{l \in I} \]

\[ \text{end}_1 <^\circ \text{end}_1, \quad \text{end}_2 <^\circ \text{end}_2 \]

Naive subtyping

\[ T <^\circ_n * \quad S <^\circ_n \circ \]

\[ \text{unit} <^\circ_n \text{unit} \]

\[ T <^\circ_n T' \quad U <^\circ_n U' \quad m <^\circ n \]

\[ \frac{T \times_m U <^\circ_n T' \times_m U'}{T \times_m U <^\circ_n T' \times_m U'} \]

\[ T <^\circ_n T' \quad S <^\circ_n S' \quad T \times^\circ T' \quad S <^\circ_n S' \quad T' \times S <^\circ_n T' \times S' \]

\[ \text{if and only if} \quad (S_k <^\circ R_k)_{k \in J} \]

\[ \text{and} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \{l_j : S_l\}_{l \in J} <^\circ \oplus \{l_j : R_j\}_{l \in J} \]

\[ J \subseteq I \quad (S_j <^\circ R_j)_{j \in J} \quad \oplus \{l_j : S_l\}_{l \in J} <^\circ \oplus \{l_j : R_j\}_{l \in J} \]

\[ I \subseteq J \quad (S_i <^\circ R_i)_{i \in I} \quad \oplus \{l_j : S_l\}_{l \in I} <^\circ \oplus \{l_j : R_j\}_{l \in I} \]

\[ \text{end}_1 <^\circ_n \text{end}_1, \quad \text{end}_2 <^\circ_n \text{end}_2 \]

Blame safety

\[ e \text{ safe for } p \quad T <^\circ U \]

\[ e \text{ safe for } \overline{p} \quad T <^\circ U \]

\[ e \text{ safe for } q \quad T <^\circ U \]

\[ e \text{ safe for } q \quad T <^\circ U \]

\[ q \neq p \quad q' \neq p \quad q \neq \overline{p} \]

\[ q \neq p \quad q' \neq p \quad q \neq \overline{p} \]

\[ \text{blame } q X \text{ safe for } p \]

\[ \text{blame } q X \text{ safe for } p \]

Fig. 15. Subtyping and blame safety.

Wadler and Findler (2009) have an additional rule that makes any subtype of a ground type a subtype of *, i.e., \( T <: * \) if \( T <: T \). This rule is not sound in Gradual GV because our collide rule blames both casts:

\[ \langle E[(v : T) \Rightarrow *] : * \Rightarrow U] \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{blame } \overline{p} q (\text{flv}(E) \cup \text{flv}(v)) \quad \text{if } T \not <: U \]

The four subtyping relations are closely related. In previous work (Wadler & Findler, 2009; Siek et al., 2015a) one has that proper subtyping decomposes into positive and negative subtyping, which—after reversing the order on negative subtyping—recompose into naive subtyping. Here we have three-quarters of the previous result.

**Theorem 5 (3/4 Tangram)**

1. \( T <: U \) implies \( T <:^+ U \) and \( T <:^\circ U \).
2. \( S <:^+ R \implies S <:^\circ R \) and \( S <:^\circ R \)
3. \( T <:^n U \) if and only if \( T <:^+ U \) and \( U <:^\circ T \).
4. \( S <:^n R \) if and only if \( S <:^+ R \) and \( R <:^\circ S \)
Igarashi et al.

Proof
By induction on types. □

Here the first and second items are an implication, rather than an equivalence as in the third and fourth items and previous work. In order to get an equivalence, we would need to alter subtyping such that $T <: *$ for all $T$ and $S <: \otimes$ for all $S$, which would interfere with our Canonical Forms lemma. However, implication in all four items is sufficient to ensure the most important result, Corollary 1 below.

The following technical result is used in the proof of Theorem 6.

Lemma 12
1. If $T \neq *$ and $T \sim T$, then $T <:^+ T$.
2. If $S \neq \otimes$ and $S \sim S$, then $S <:^+ S$.

Proof
(1) A case analysis on $T$. Lemma 10 tells us that $T$ is unique. We show the case for functions. Let $T$ be the type $U \rightarrow_m V$; we know that $T$ is $* \rightarrow_m *$, that $* <:^+ U$, and $V <:^+ *$. Conclude with the positive subtyping rule rule for functions. (2) Similar. □

We say that a process $P$ is safe for blame label $p$, if all occurrences of casts involving $p$ or $\overline{p}$ correspond to subsumptions in the (positive or negative) blame subtyping relation. Figure 15 defines judgments $e$ safe for $p$ and $P$ safe for $p$, extended homomorphically to all other forms of expressions and processes. The safe for predicate on well-typed programs is preserved by reduction.

Theorem 6 (Preservation of safe terms)
If $\Gamma \vdash P$ with $P$ safe for $p$ and $P \rightarrow Q$, then $Q$ safe for $p$.

Proof
It is sufficient to examine all reductions whose contractum involves coercions. We start with the reductions in Figure 6. The four rules starting from the one with reductum $v: T \nrightarrow *$ follow from Lemma 12. Then, the standard function cast is analogous to previous work (Wadler & Findler, 2009), and the case for pairs is similar. The casts for session types (send, receive, select, case, close, and wait) are new; we concentrate on send.

$$\text{send}_v(w: !T.S \nrightarrow !T'.S') \rightarrow (\text{send}(v: T' \nrightarrow T)w): S \nrightarrow S'$$

By assumption $(w: !T.S \nrightarrow !T'.S')$ safe for $p$. Inversion of the safe for relation yields $T' <:^+ T$ and $S <:^+ S'$. Hence $(v: T' \nrightarrow T)$ safe for $p$ and $(\ldots): S \nrightarrow S'$ safe for $p$. Finally, all rules in Figure 7 preserve casts. □

A process $P$ blames label $p$ if $P \equiv \Pi((e) | Q)$ where $e$ is blame $p q X$, blame $q p X$, or blame $p X$, for some $q$ and $X$, and prefix $\Pi$ of bindings for channel endpoints and linear references.

Theorem 7 (Progress of safe terms)
If $\Gamma \vdash P$ and $P$ safe for $p$, then $P \not\rightarrow Q$ where $Q$ blames $p$.

Proof
We analyse all reduction rules whose contractum includes blame. From Figure 6 take the rule with reductum \((v:\ T \overset{P}{\rightarrow} \ast): \ast \overset{\phi}{\Rightarrow} U\). It may blame \(p\) and \(q\), if \(T \not< U\). However, if it is safe for \(p\) then \(T \not< \ast\), which cannot hold (because only \(\ast \not< \ast\) and \(T\) cannot be \(\ast\)), and similar reasoning applies for \(q\) and \(U\). The remaining rules are similar.

We are finally in a position to state the main result of this section.

**Corollary 1 (Well-typed programs can’t be blamed)**

Let \(P\) be a well-typed process with a subterm of the form \(e: T \overset{P}{\Rightarrow} U\) containing the only occurrence of \(p\) and \(\overline{p}\) in \(P\). Then:

1. If \(T \not<+ U\) then \(P \not\rightarrow^\ast Q\) where \(Q\) blames \(p\).
2. If \(T \not<- U\) then \(P \not\rightarrow^\ast Q\) where \(Q\) blames \(\overline{p}\).
3. If \(T <: U\) then \(P \not\rightarrow^\ast Q\) where \(Q\) blames \(p\) or \(\overline{p}\).

For example, the redex \((v:\ T \overset{P}{\rightarrow} \ast): \ast \overset{\phi}{\Rightarrow} U\) may fail and blame \(p\) and \(q\) if \(T \not< U\). And indeed we have that \(T \not<: \ast\) and \(\ast \not<: U\), so it is not safe for \(p\) or \(q\). However, \(T \not<+ \ast\) and \(\ast \not<- U\), and the redex will not blame \(p\) or \(\overline{p}\).

Wadler and Findler (2009) explain how casting between terms related by naive subtyping always places the blame (if any) on the less-precisely-typed term or context, as appropriate.

### 4.3 Properties of \(\text{GGV}_e\)

Now we turn our attention to \(\text{GGV}_e\) and prove that cast insertion succeeds for well typed \(\text{GGV}_e\) expressions and preserves typing and that the \(\text{GGV}_e\) typing conservatively extends the GV typing. As we need to relate the judgments of different systems, let \(\vdash_e\) denote the \(\text{GGV}_e\) typing, \(\vdash\) denote the GV typing, and \(\vdash_{GV}\) denote the GV typing.

**Lemma 13 (Consistent Subtyping)**

1. \(T_1 \subseteq T_2\) if and only if \(T_1 \sim T_1'\) and \(T_1' <: T_2\) for some \(T_1'\).
2. \(T_1 \subseteq T_2\) if and only if \(T_1 <: T_2\) and \(T_2 \sim T_2\) for some \(T_2\).

The next lemma clarifies the relation between subtyping, polarised consistent subtyping, and consistent subtyping.

**Lemma 14 (Subtyping Hierarchy)**

For all polarities \(u\), it holds that \(:< \subseteq^u \subseteq \subseteq\).

**Lemma 15**

For all \(u\), \(\subseteq^u\) is a partial order.

**Lemma 16 (Upper bound and lower bound)**

1. If \(T_1 \lor T_2 = U\), then \(T_1 \subseteq^\otimes U\) and \(T_2 \subseteq^\otimes U\).
2. If \(T_1 \land T_2 = U\), then \(U \subseteq^\oplus T_1\) and \(U \subseteq^\oplus T_2\).

**Lemma 17 (Least upper bound and greatest lower bound)**

1. For all \(U\) such that \(T_1 \subseteq^\otimes U\) and \(T_2 \subseteq^\otimes U\) there exists some \(U'\) such that \(T_1 \lor T_2 = U'\) and \(U' \subseteq^\otimes U\).
2. For all \(U\) such that \(U \subseteq^\oplus T_1\) and \(U \subseteq^\oplus T_2\) there exists some \(U'\) such that \(T_1 \land T_2 = U'\) and \(U \subseteq^\oplus U'\).
Theorem 8 states that cast insertion succeeds for well-typed external language and preserves typing. A few lemmas are required in preparation.

Lemma 18
If \( T_1 \lor T_2 = U \), then \( T_1 \preceq U \) and \( T_2 \preceq U \).

Proof
Immediate from Lemmas 14 and 16.

Lemma 19
If \( T \triangleright U \), then \( T \preceq U \).

Proof
By case analysis on \( T \triangleright U \).

Theorem 8 (Cast insertion succeeds and preserves typing)
If \( \Gamma \vdash e : T \), then there exists some \( f \) such that \( \Gamma \vdash e \leadsto f : T \) and \( \Gamma \vdash f : T \).

Proof
By rules induction on the derivation of \( \Gamma \vdash e : T \). We show main cases below.

**Case** application rule: We are given \( \Gamma = \Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \) and \( e = e_1 e_2 \) and \( T = T_{12} \) and \( \Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 : T_1 \) and \( \Gamma_2 \vdash e_2 : T_2 \) and \( T_1 \triangleright_m T_{12} \) and \( T_2 \preceq T_{11} \).

By \( \Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 : T_1 \) and the IH, \( \Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 \leadsto f_1 : T_1 \) and \( \Gamma_1 \vdash f_1 : T_1 \) for some \( f_1 \).

By \( \Gamma_2 \vdash e_2 : T_2 \) and the IH, \( \Gamma_2 \vdash e_2 \leadsto f_2 : T_2 \) and \( \Gamma_2 \vdash f_2 : T_2 \) for some \( f_2 \).

Let \( f = (f_1 : T_1 \triangleright \gamma \rightarrow_m T_{12}) \) and \( (f_2 : T_2 \triangleright \gamma \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow_m T_{11}) \). By the application rule, \( \Gamma \vdash e \leadsto f : T \).

Now, we assume \( f_1 : T_1 \triangleright \gamma \rightarrow_m T_{12} \) equals \( f_1 : T_1 \triangleright \gamma \rightarrow_m T_{11} \), but even when \( f_1 : T_1 \triangleright \gamma \rightarrow_m T_{12} \) equals \( f_1 \), we could use the subsumption rule instead of the cast rule in the following proof. We also take similar assumptions in the rest of the proof.

By \( \Gamma_1 \vdash f_1 : T_1 \) and Lemma 19, \( T_1 \preceq T_{11} \rightarrow_m T_{12} \). By \( \Gamma_1 \vdash f_1 : T_1 \) and the cast rule, \( \Gamma_1 \vdash (f_2 : T_2 \triangleright \gamma \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow_m T_{11}) \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow_m T_{12} \).

By \( \Gamma_2 \vdash f_2 : T_2 \) and \( T_2 \preceq T_{11} \) and the cast rule, \( \Gamma_2 \vdash (f_2 : T_2 \triangleright \gamma \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow_m T_{11}) : T_{12} \).

Thus, by the application rule, \( \Gamma \vdash f : T \).

**Case** case rule: We are given \( \Gamma = \Gamma' \circ \Delta \) and \( e = \text{case } e' \) of \( \{ l_j : x_j, e_j \}_{j \in J} \) and \( T = U \) and \( \Gamma' \vdash e' : T' \) and \( T \triangleright \gamma \) and \( \{ l_j : R_j \}_{j \in J} \) and \( \Delta, x_j : R_j \vdash e_j : U_j \) and \( U = \lor \{ U_j \}_{j \in J} \).

By \( \Gamma' \vdash e' : T' \) and the IH, \( \Gamma' \vdash e' \leadsto f' : T' \) and \( \Gamma' \vdash f' : T' \) for some \( f' \).

Take any \( j \in J \). By \( \Delta, x_j : R_j \vdash e_j : U_j \) and the IH, we have \( \Delta, x_j : R_j \vdash e_j \leadsto f_j : U_j \) and \( \Delta, x_j : R_j \vdash f_j : U_j \) for some \( f_j \).

Let \( f = \text{case } f' : T' \triangleright \gamma \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow U \) of \( \{ l_j : x_j, f_j : U_j \triangleright \gamma \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow U \}_{j \in J} \). By the case rule, \( \Gamma \vdash e \leadsto f : T \).

By \( T' \triangleright \gamma \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow U \) and Lemma 19, \( T' \preceq \lor \{ l_j : R_j \}_{j \in J} \). By \( \Gamma' \vdash f' : T' \) and the cast rule, \( \Gamma' \vdash (f' : T' \triangleright \gamma \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow U) \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow U \).

Take any \( j \in J \). By \( U = \lor \{ U_j \}_{j \in J} \) and Lemma 18, \( U \preceq U \). By \( \Delta, x_j : R_j \vdash f_j : U_j \) and the cast rule, \( \Delta, x_j : R_j \vdash (f_j : U_j \triangleright U) : U \).

Thus, by the case rule, \( \Gamma \vdash f : T \).
A type $T$ is static if $T$ does not contain one of the dynamic types: $\ast$ or $\otimes$. A type environment $\Gamma$ is static if $\Gamma$ contains only static types. An expression $e$ of GGV$_{e}$ is static if all types declared in $e$ are static.

**Lemma 20**

1. Suppose $T, U$ are static. If $T \triangleleft U$, then $T < U$.
2. Suppose $T \triangleright U$ and $T \neq \ast, \otimes$.
   - (a) If $U$ is neither $\&$-type nor $\oplus$-type, then $T = U$.
   - (b) If $U$ is either $\&$-type or $\oplus$-type, then $T < U$.
   - (c) If $T$ is static and $U$ is not $\&$-type, then $U$ is static.
3. Suppose $T_{1}, T_{2}$ are static. If $T_{1} \lor T_{2} = U$, then
   - (a) $U$ is static,
   - (b) $T_{1} < U$ and $T_{2} < U$,
   - (c) $U < U'$ for any static $U'$ such that $T_{1} < U'$ and $T_{2} < U'$.
4. Suppose $T_{1}, T_{2}, U'$ are static. If $T_{1} < U'$ and $T_{2} < U'$, then there exists some static $U$ such that $U = T_{1} \lor T_{2}$.

**Proof**

1. By induction on $T \triangleleft U$. 2. By case analysis on $T \triangleright U$.

   We have if $T, U$ are static and $T \triangleleft \triangleleft U$, then $T < U$. This is shown by induction on $T \triangleleft \triangleleft U$. With Lemma 14, if $T, U$ are static, then $T < U$ if and only if $T \triangleleft \triangleleft U$. 3, 4 can be proved by Lemmas 16 and 17 with this fact. \(\square\)

Theorem 9 states that the GGV$_{e}$ typing is a conservative extension of the GV typing. We have to take care of the difference between the declarative type system of GV and the algorithmic type system of GGV$_{e}$.

We define the erasing map $|e|$ which removes type annotations from an expression $e$ of GGV$_{e}$. The definition is straightforward and main cases are:

$$
|\text{new} S| = \text{new}
$$

$$
|\lambda_{m} x : T. e| = \lambda_{m} x. |e|.
$$

(It is extended homomorphically for all other forms of expressions.)

**Theorem 9 (Typing Conservation over GV)**

Suppose that $\Gamma$ is static.

1. If $e$ is static and type environments that appear in the derivation of $\Gamma \vdash_{e} e : T$ are all static, then $\Gamma \vdash_{GV} |e| : T$ and $T$ is static.
2. If $f$ is an expression of GV and $\Gamma \vdash_{GV} f : T$, then $T$ is static and there exist static $e$ and static $T'$ such that $|e| = f$ and $\Gamma \vdash_{e} e : T'$ and $T' < : T$.

**Proof**

1. By induction on $\Gamma \vdash_{e} e : T$ with case analysis on the rule applied last. We show the main cases below.

**Case** application rule: We are given $\Gamma = \Gamma_{1} \circ \Gamma_{2}$ and $e = e_{1} e_{2}$ and $T = T_{12}$ and $\Gamma_{1} \vdash_{e_{1}} e_{1} : T_{1}$ and $\Gamma_{2} \vdash_{e_{2}} e_{2}$ and $T_{1} \triangleright T_{11} \rightarrow_{m} T_{12}$ and $T_{2} \triangleleft T_{11}$. Since $\Gamma$, $e$ are static, $\Gamma_{1}$, $\Gamma_{2}$, $e_{1}$, $e_{2}$ are also static.
By $\Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 : T_1$ and the IH, $\Gamma_1 \vdash \text{true} : T_1$ and $T_1$ is static. By $T_1 \triangleright T_{11} \rightarrow_m T_{12}$ and Lemma 20, $T_1 = T_{11} \rightarrow_m T_{12}$ and $T_{11}, T_{12}$ are static.

By $\Gamma_2 \vdash e_2 : T_2$ and the IH, $\Gamma_2 \vdash \text{true} : T_2$ and $T_2$ is static. By $T_2 \preceq T_{11}$ and Lemma 20, $T_2 \ll T_{11}$. By the subsumption rule, $\Gamma_2 \vdash \text{true} : T_{11}$. Thus, by $\Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 : T_{11} \rightarrow_m T_{12}$ and $\Gamma_2 \vdash \text{true} : T_{11}$ and the application rule, we have $\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \vdash e_1, e_2 : T_{12}$ because $\text{true}, \text{true} = \text{true}$.1

**Case** case rule: We are given $\Gamma = \Gamma' \circ \Delta$ and $e = \text{case}\, e' \text{ of } \{ l_j : x_j, e_j \}_{j \in J}$ and $T = U$ and $\Gamma' \vdash e' : T'$ and $T' \triangleright \{ l_j : R_j \}_{j \in J}$ and $(\Delta, x_j : R_j \vdash e_j : U_j)_{j \in J}$ and $U = \bigvee \{ U_j \}_{j \in J}$. Since $\Gamma, e$ are static, $\Gamma', \Delta, e', e_j$ are also static. Since any type environment $\Delta, x_j : R_j$ is static, any $R_j$ is static.

By $\Gamma' \vdash e' : T'$ and the IH, $\Gamma' \vdash e'' : T'$ and $T' \triangleright \{ l_j : R_j \}_{j \in J}$ and Lemma 20, $T' \ll \{ l_j : R_j \}_{j \in J}$. By the subsumption rule, $\Gamma' \vdash e' : \{ l_j : R_j \}_{j \in J}$.

Take any $j \in J$. Since $\Delta, x_j : R_j$ is static, by $\Delta, x_j : R_j \vdash e_j : U_j$ and the IH, $\Delta, x_j : R_j \vdash e_j : U_j$ and $U_j$ is static. By $U = \bigvee \{ U_j \}_{j \in J}$ and Lemma 20, $U_j \ll U$ and $U$ is static. By the subsumption rule, $\Delta, x_j : R_j \vdash \text{true} : U_j$.

Thus, $\Gamma' \vdash e' : \{ l_j : R_j \}_{j \in J}$ and $(\Delta, x_j : R_j \vdash \text{true} : U_j)_{j \in J}$ and the case rule, we have $\Gamma' \circ \Delta \vdash \text{case}\, e' \text{ of } \{ l_j : x_j, e_j \}_{j \in J} : U$.

because $\text{case}\, e' \text{ of } \{ l_j : x_j, e_j \}_{j \in J} = \text{case}\, e' \text{ of } \{ l_j : x_j, e_j \}_{j \in J}$.

2. By induction on $\Gamma \vdash_{\text{GV}} f : T$ with case analysis on the rule applied last. We show main cases below.

**Case** application rule: We are given $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2$ and $f = f_1 f_2$ and $T = T_{12}$ and $\Gamma_1 \vdash f_1 : T_{11} \rightarrow_m T_{12}$ and $\Gamma_2 \vdash f_2 : T_{11}$. Since $\Gamma$ is static, $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$ are also static.

By $\Gamma_1 \vdash f_1 : T_{11} \rightarrow_m T_{12}$ and the IH, $T_{11}, T_{12}$ are static and there exist static $e_1, U_1$ such that $\Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 : U_1$ and $T_{11} \ll \{ l_j : R_j \}_{j \in J}$ and $e_1 = f_1$. By inversion of $\ll$, we have $U_1 = U_{11} \rightarrow_n U_{12}$ and $n < m$ and $T_{11} \ll U_{11}$ and $U_{12} \ll T_{12}$ for some $U_{11}, U_{12}, n$. Since $U_1$ is static, $U_{11}, U_{12}$ are also static.

By $\Gamma_2 \vdash f_2 : T_{11}$ and the IH, $T_{11}$ is static and there exist static $e_2, U_2$ such that $\Gamma_2 \vdash e_2 : T_{11}$ and $\text{false} = f_2$.

By $U_2 \ll T_{11}$ and transitivity, $U_2 \ll U_{11}$. By Lemma 14, $U_2 \ll U_{11}$. We have $U_{11} = U_{12}$ and $U_{11} = U_{12}$ from Figure 9.

Thus, by the application rule, $\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \vdash e_1 e_2 : U_{11}$. Here, we have $|e_1 e_2| = |e_1| |e_2| = f_1 f_2 = f$, and already have $U_{12} \ll T_{12} = T$.

**Case** case rule: We are given $\Gamma = \Gamma' \circ \Delta$ and $f = \text{case}\, f' \text{ of } \{ l_j : x_j, f_j \}_{j \in J}$ and $\Gamma' \vdash f' : \{ l_j : R_j \}_{j \in J}$ and $(\Delta, x_j : R_j \vdash f_j : T_{j})_{j \in J}$. Since $\Gamma$ is static, $\Gamma', \Delta$ are also static.

By $\Gamma' \vdash f' : \{ l_j : R_j \}_{j \in J}$ and the IH, all $R_j$ are static and there exist static $e', T'$ such that $|e'| = f'$ and $\Gamma' \vdash e' : T'$ and $T' \ll \{ l_j : R_j \}_{j \in J}$.

By $T' \ll \{ l_j : R_j \}_{j \in J}$ and Lemma 14, $T' \ll \{ l_j : R_j \}_{j \in J}$.

Take any $j \in J$. By $\Delta, x_j : R_j \vdash f_j : T$ and the IH, $T$ is static and there exist static $e_j, T_j$ such that $|e_j| = f_j$ and $\Delta, x_j : R_j \vdash e_j : T_j$ and $T_j \ll : T$.

Thus, $(T_j \ll : T)_{j \in J}$. By Lemma 20, there exist some static $T$ such that $T = \bigvee \{ T_j \}_{j \in J}$.

By Lemma 20, $T \ll T$.

Thus, by the case rule, $\Gamma' \circ \Delta \vdash \text{case}\, f' \text{ of } \{ l_j : x_j, e_j \}_{j \in J} : U$. Here, we have $|\text{case}\, f' \text{ of } \{ l_j : x_j, e_j \}_{j \in J}| = |\text{case}\, f' \text{ of } \{ l_j : x_j, e_j \}_{j \in J}| = \text{case}\, f' \text{ of } \{ l_j : x_j, f_j \}_{j \in J} = f$.
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and already have $U <: T$.

**Case** subsumption rule: We are given $\Gamma \vdash f : U$ and $U <: T$. By the IH, $U$ is static and there exist static $e$ and $U'$ such that $\Gamma \vdash e : U'$ and $U' <: U$ and $|e| = f$. By transitivity, $U' <: T$.

Lemma 21 states that the cast-insertion translation does not insert casts for static expressions, which can be seen as expressions of GV if type annotations are removed. The proof is similar to that of clause 1 of Theorem 9.

**Lemma 21**

Suppose that $\Gamma$ and $e$ are both static. If $\Gamma \vdash e \leadsto f : T$, then $|e| = f$ and $T$ is static.

**Proof**

By induction on $\Gamma \vdash e \leadsto f : T$, with case analysis on the rule applied last. We show main cases below.

**Case** application rule: We are given $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2$ and $e = e_1 e_2$ and $f = (f_1 : T_1 \implies T_{11} \to m) (f_2 : T_2 \implies T_{11})$ and $T = T_{12}$ and $\Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 \leadsto f_1 : T_1$ and $\Gamma_2 \vdash e_2 \leadsto f_2 : T_2$ and $T_1 \triangleright T_{11} \to m T_{12}$ and $T_2 \lesssim T_{11}$. Since $\Gamma, e$ are static, $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, e_1, e_2$ are also static.

By $\Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 \leadsto f_1 : T_1$ and the IH, $|e_1| = f_1$ and $T_1$ is static. By $T_1 \triangleright T_{11} \to m T_{12}$ and Lemma 20, $T_1 = T_{11} \to m T_{12}$ and $T_{11}, T_{12}$ are static. Thus, $f_1 : T_1 \implies T_{11} \to m T_{12} = f_1 = |e_1|$.

By $\Gamma_2 \vdash e_2 \leadsto f_2 : T_2$ and the IH, $|e_2| = f_2$ and $T_2$ is static. By $T_2 \lesssim T_{11}$ and Lemma 20, $T_2 <: T_{11}$. Thus, $f_2 : T_2 \implies T_{11} = f_2 = |e_2|$. Now, we have $f = |e_1| |e_2| = |e_1 e_2|$.

5 Related Work

Languages mentioned in the introduction include Agda (Norell, 2009), Coq (Chlipala, 2013), Idris (Brady, 2013), Eff (Bauer & Pretnar, 2015), Frank (Lindley et al., 2017), Koka (Leijen, 2017), Links (Lindley & Morris, 2016b), Scribble (Yoshida et al., 2014), and Singularity OS (Fähndrich et al., 2006).

5.1 Gradual Typing

Findler and Felleisen (2002) introduced two seminal ideas: higher-order contracts that dynamically monitor conformance to a type discipline, and blame to indicate whether it is the library or the client which is at fault if the contract is violated. Siek and Taha (2006) introduced gradual types to integrate untyped and typed code, while Flanagan (2006) introduced hybrid types to integrate simple types with refinement types. Both used target languages with explicit casts and similar translations from source to target; both exploit contract, but neither allocates blame. Motivated by similarities between gradual and hybrid types, Wadler and Findler (2009) introduced blame calculus, which unifies the two by encompassing untyped, simply-typed, and refinement-typed code. As the name indicates,
it also restores blame, which enables a proof of blame safety: blame for type errors always lays with less-precisely typed code—"well-typed programs can’t be blamed".

Siek and others (2015b) review desirable properties of gradually-typed languages, while Wadler (2015) discusses the history of the blame calculus and why blame is important. These papers provide overviews of the field, each with many further citations.

As noted in the introduction, gradual typing may be important as a bridge to type systems that go beyond what is currently available, including dependent, effect, and session types. There is a range of gradual type systems for dependent types (Ou et al., 2004; Flanagan, 2006; Greenberg et al., 2010). A gradual type systems for effect types was explored by Banados Schwerter and others (2014). Gradual type systems related to session types include the run-time enforcement of affine typing of Tov and Pucella (2010), and the gradual typestate of Wolf and others (2011). Thiemann (2014) describes a system with gradual types and session types, but in it only types (and not session types) can be gradual.

Practical languages exploiting gradual types include type Dynamic in C# (Bierman et al., 2010), TypeScript (Bierman et al., 2014), Hack (Verlaguet, 2013), and Dart (Team, 2014).

TypeScript TPD (Williams et al., 2017) applies contracts to monitor the gradual typing of TypeScript, and evaluates the successes and shortcomings of contracts in this context.

### 5.2 Session Types

Session types were introduced by Honda, Vasconcelos, and Kubo (1993; 1998). The original system addressed binary sessions, whereby types describe the interaction between two partners. Binary sessions were eventually extended to the more general setting of multiparty session types (Honda et al., 2016). Recent years have seen the introduction of session types in programming languages, and software development tools. We review the most important works.

Session types inspired the design of several programming languages. Sing# (Fähndrich et al., 2006) constitutes one of the first attempts to introduce session types in programming languages. An extension of C, Sing# was used to implement Singularity, an operating system based on message passing. Gay and others (2010) propose attaching session types to class definitions, allowing to treat channels as objects for session-based communication in distributed systems. SePi (Franco & Vasconcelos, 2013) is a concurrent, message-passing programming language based on the pi-calculus, featuring a simple form of refinement types. SILL (Toninho et al., 2013; Pfenning & Griffith, 2015) is a higher-order session functional programming language, featuring process expressions as first class objects via a linear contextual monad. Concurrent C0 (Willsey et al., 2017) is a type-safe C-like programming language equipped with channel communication governed by session types. Links (Lindley & Morris, 2017) is a functional programming language designed for tierless web applications that natively supports binary session types.

Proposals have been made to retroactively introduce session types in mainstream programming languages. Session Java (Hu et al., 2008) introduces API-based session primitives in Java, while (Hu et al., 2010) presents a Java language extension and type discipline for session-based event-driven programming. Featherweight Erlang (Mostrous & Vasconcelos, 2011) imposes a session-based type system to discipline message passing in Erlang. Mungo (Kouzapas et al., 2016) is a tool for checking Java code against session types,
presented in the form of typestates. Embedding of session types have been proposed for Haskell (Orchard & Yoshida, 2016; Pucella & Tov, 2008; Sackman & Eisenbach, 2008; Polakow, 2015; Lindley & Morris, 2016a), OCaml (Padovani, 2017). Scala (Scalas & Yoshida, 2016), and Rust (Jespersen et al., 2015). Most of these embeddings delegate linearity checks on the run-time system.

Session types can be used in the software development process under different forms, including languages to describe protocols, specialised libraries to invoke session-based communication primitives, provision for run-time monitoring against session types, and extended type checkers. Scribble (Honda et al., 2011) is a language-agnostic protocol description formalism used in many different tools. Multiparty Session C (Ng et al., 2012) uses Scribble, a compiler plug-in, and a C library to validate against session types. Hu and Yoshida (2016) generate protocol-specific Java APIs from multiparty session types described in Scribble. SPY (Neykova et al., 2013) generates run-time monitors for endpoint communication from Scribble protocols. Neykova and Yoshida (2014) design and implemented a session actor library in Python together with a run-time verification mechanism. Bocchi and others (2017) present a theory that incorporates both static typing and dynamic monitoring of session types. Fowler (2016) describes a framework for monitoring Erlang applications against multiparty session types. Neykova and Yoshida (2017) investigate failure handling for Erlang processes in a system that dynamically monitors session types. Dingo Hunter (Ng & Yoshida, 2016) and Gong (Lange et al., 2017) statically detect (partial) deadlocks in Go programs by extracting behavioural types from programs.

6 Conclusions

We presented the design of Gradual GV, which combines a session-typed language GV along the lines of Gay and Vasconcelos (2010) with a blame calculus along the lines of Wadler and Findler (2009), and with dynamic enforcement of linearity along the lines of Tov and Pucella (2010). We established the expected results for such a language, including type safety and blame safety.

Much remains to be done; we consider just one future direction here. The embedding of linear types in the unrestricted dynamic type relies on an indirection through a cell in the store. In our present work, these cells are used once and then discarded. This one-shot policy imposes a certain usage pattern on linear values embedded in the unityped language. In particular, the send and receive operations on a channel need to be chained as in (close (send v2 (send v1 c))). However, one could imagine a unityped language where one may use the channel non-linearly in an imperative style as in (send v1 c; send v2 c; close c), mimicking the style of network programming in conventional languages. This style can also be supported by a variant of Gradual GV with a multi-shot policy that restores an updated channel to the same cell from which it was extracted. We leave the full formalisation of this policy to future work.
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A Typechecking Algorithm for the External Language

We give a typechecking algorithm for GGV, and show that it is correct. The typechecking algorithm is slightly involved due to linearity: CHECKEXPR(Γ, e) outputs a pair of type T and a set X of variables, containing the linear variables occurring free in e.

function CHECKEXPR(Γ, e)
   case e of
      | z ⇒
         assert z ∈ dom(Γ)
         T := Γ(z)
         if lin(T) then return T, {z}
         else return T, Ø
      | () ⇒ return unit, Ø
      | λmx:T1. e1 ⇒
         T2, Y := CHECKEXPR((Γ, x : T1), e1)
44  
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if lin($T_1$) and $m = \text{un}$ then
  assert $Y = \{x\}$
  return $T_1 \rightarrow_{\text{un}} T_2, \emptyset$
else if lin($T_1$) and $m = \text{lin}$ then
  assert $x \in Y$
  return $T_1 \rightarrow_{\text{lin}} T_2, Y \setminus \{x\}$
else if un($T_1$) and $m = \text{un}$ then
  assert $Y = \emptyset$
  return $T_1 \rightarrow_{\text{un}} T_2, \emptyset$
else return $T_1 \rightarrow_{\text{un}} T_2, Y$

| $e_1 e_2 \Rightarrow$
  $T_1, X := \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_1); T_2, Y := \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_2)$
  assert $X \cap Y = \emptyset$
  $T_{11} \rightarrow_{m} T_{12} := \text{MATCHINGFUN}(T_1)$
  assert $T_2 \preceq T_{11}$
  return $T_{12}, X \cup Y$
| $(e_1, e_2)_m \Rightarrow$
  $T_1, X := \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_1); T_2, Y := \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_2)$
  assert $X \cap Y = \emptyset$
  if $m = \text{un}$ then assert un($T_1$) and un($T_2$)
  return $T_1 \times_{m} T_2, X \cup Y$

| let $x_1, x_2 = e_1$ in $e_2 \Rightarrow$
  $T, Y := \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_1)$
  $T_1 \times_{m} T_2 := \text{MATCHINGPROD}(T)$
  $U, Z := \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, x : T_1, y : T_2, e_2)$
  if lin($T_1$) then
    assert $x_1 \in Z$
    $Z := Z \setminus \{x_1\}$
  if lin($T_2$) then
    assert $x_2 \in Z$
    $Z := Z \setminus \{x_2\}$
  assert $Y \cap Z = \emptyset$
  return $U, Y \cup Z$

| fork $e_1 \Rightarrow$
  $T, X := \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_1)$
  assert $T \sim \text{unit}$
  return unit, $X$

| new $S \Rightarrow$ return $S \times_{m} X, \emptyset$

| send $e_1 e_2 \Rightarrow$
  $T_1, X := \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_1); T_2, Y := \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_2)$
  assert $X \cap Y = \emptyset$
  $! T_3, S := \text{MATCHINGSEND}(T_2)$
  assert $T_1 \preceq T_3$
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\[ \text{return } S, X \cup Y \]

\[ | \text{receive } e_1 \Rightarrow \]
\[ T_1, X := \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_1) \]
\[ ?T_2, S := \text{MATCHINGRECEIVE}(T_1) \]
\[ \text{return } T_2 \times_{\text{in}} S, X \]

\[ | \text{select } l, e_1 \Rightarrow \]
\[ T, X := \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_1) \]
\[ \oplus \{ l_j : S_j \} := \text{MATCHINGSELECT}(T, l_j) \]
\[ \text{return } S_j, X \]

\[ | \text{case } e_0 \text{ of } \{ l_1 : e_1, \ldots, l_k : e_k \} \Rightarrow \]
\[ T, X := \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_0) \]
\[ \& \{ l_1 : R_1, \ldots, l_k : R_k \} := \text{MATCHINGCASE}(T, \{ l_1, \ldots, l_k \}) \]
\[ \text{for } j = 1 \text{ to } k \text{ do } \]
\[ U_j, Y_j := \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, x_j, e_j) \]
\[ \text{assert } x_j \in Y_j \]
\[ Y_j := Y_j \setminus \{ x_j \} \]
\[ \text{assert } Y_1 = \cdots = Y_k (=: Y) \]
\[ U := U_1 \lor \cdots \lor U_k \]
\[ \text{assert } X \cap Y = \emptyset \]
\[ \text{return } U, X \cup Y \]

\[ | \text{close } e_1 \Rightarrow \]
\[ T, X := \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_1) \]
\[ \text{assert } T \sim \text{end}_1, \]
\[ \text{return } \text{unit}, X \]

\[ | \text{wait } e_1 \Rightarrow \]
\[ T, X := \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_1) \]
\[ \text{assert } T \sim \text{end}_1, \]
\[ \text{return } \text{unit}, X \]

function MATCHINGFUN(T)

\[ \text{case } T \text{ of } \]
\[ | T_1 \rightarrow_m T_2 \Rightarrow \text{return } T_1 \rightarrow_m T_2 \]
\[ | \_ \Rightarrow \text{return } \_ \rightarrow_{\text{in}} \_ \]

function MATCHINGPROD(T)

\[ \text{case } T \text{ of } \]
\[ | T_1 \times_m T_2 \Rightarrow \text{return } T_1 \times_m T_2 \]
\[ | \_ \Rightarrow \text{return } \_ \times_{\text{in}} \_ \]

function MATCHINGSEND(T)

\[ \text{case } T \text{ of } \]
\[ | !T'.S \Rightarrow \text{return } !T'.S \]
\[ | \_ \Rightarrow \text{return } !\_. \_ \]
Suppose $y \in \Gamma$ with $\text{lin}(U)$. If $\text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e) = T, X$ and $y \notin X$, then $\text{CHECKEXPR}(\text{rm}(\Gamma, \{y\}), e) = T, X$.

**Proof**

By induction on $e$. We show one important case below.

**Case** $e = e_1 \And e_2$: We are given $\Gamma(y) = U$ and $\text{lin}(U)$ and $\text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_1 \And e_2) = T, X$ and $y \notin X$. By the definition of the algorithm, $\text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_i) = T_i, X_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $T_1 \lor T_1 \rightarrow m T_2$ and $T_2 \preceq T_1$ and $T = T_2$ and $X = X_1 \uplus X_2$. Since $y \notin X$, we have $y \notin X_1$ and $y \notin X_2$.

By $\text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_1) = T_1, X_1$ and $y \notin X_1$ and the IH, $\text{CHECKEXPR}(\text{rm}(\Gamma, \{y\}), e_1) = T_1, X_1$. Similarly, $\text{CHECKEXPR}(\text{rm}(\Gamma, \{y\}), e_2) = T_2, X_2$. Thus, by the definition of the algorithm, $\text{CHECKEXPR}(\text{rm}(\Gamma, \{y\}), e_1 \And e_2) = T, X$.

\[\square\]

**Lemma 23**

Suppose $\text{flv}(\Gamma) = X_1 \uplus X_2$. If $\Gamma_1 = \text{rm}(\Gamma, X_2)$ and $\Gamma_2 = \text{rm}(\Gamma, X_1)$, then $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2$ and $\text{flv}(\Gamma_1) = X_1$ and $\text{flv}(\Gamma_2) = X_2$.

**Proof**
Gradual Session Types

By induction on e. □

**Theorem 10 (Soundness of the typechecking algorithm)**

If \( \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e) = T, X \) and \( \text{flv}(\Gamma) = X \), then \( \Gamma \vdash_e e : T \).

**Proof**

By induction on e. We show main cases below.

**Case** \( e = \lambda x : T_1. e_1 \):

We are given \( \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, \lambda x : T_1. e_1) = T, X \) and \( \text{flv}(\Gamma) = X \).

Let us consider only when \( m = \text{un} \) and \( \text{lin}(T_1) \).

By the definition of the algorithm, \( \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, x : T_1, e_1) = T_2, \{ x \} \) and \( X = \emptyset \).

Thus, \( \text{flv}(\Gamma) = X = \emptyset \). By \( \text{lin}(T_1) \), we have \( \text{flv}(\Gamma, x : T_1) = \{ x \} \).

Thus, by the IH, we have \( \Gamma, x : T_1 \vdash e_1 : T_2 \).

Here, by \( \text{flv}(\Gamma) = \emptyset \), we have \( \text{un}(\Gamma) \). Then, we use the abstraction rule.

**Case** \( e = e_1 e_2 \):

We are given \( \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_1 e_2) = T, X \) and \( \text{flv}(\Gamma) = X \).

By the definition of the algorithm, \( \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_1, e_2) = T_1, X_1 \) and \( \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_2) = T_2, X_2 \).

Let \( \Gamma_1 = \text{rm}(\Gamma, X_2) \) and \( \Gamma_2 = \text{rm}(\Gamma, X_1) \).

By Lemma 23, \( \Gamma = \Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2 \) and \( \text{flv}(\Gamma_1) = X_1 \) and \( \text{flv}(\Gamma_2) = X_2 \).

By \( \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_1) = T_1, X_1 \) and Lemma 22, \( \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_1) = T_1, X_1 \).

By \( \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_2) = T_2, X_2 \) and Lemma 22, \( \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e_2) = T_2, X_2 \).

By \( \text{flv}(\Gamma_1) = X_1 \) and \( \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma_1, e_1) = T_1, X_1 \) and the IH, \( \Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 : T_1 \).

By \( \text{flv}(\Gamma_2) = X_2 \) and \( \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma_2, e_2) = T_2, X_2 \) and the IH, \( \Gamma_2 \vdash e_2 : T_2 \).

Then, we use the application rule. □

We will also show the converse of the theorem above. Completeness states that \( \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e) \) computes a minimal type with respect to polarised consistent subtyping.

**Theorem 11 (Completeness of the typechecking algorithm)**

If \( \Gamma \vdash_e e : T \), then \( \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma, e) = T', X \) and \( T' \preccurlyeq T \) and \( \text{flv}(\Gamma) = X \) for some \( T' \).

To prove this theorem, we need a stronger statement, namely Lemma 27. We define environment positive consistent subtyping, written \( \Gamma' \preccurlyeq \Gamma \), as \( \text{dom}(\Gamma') \subseteq \text{dom}(\Gamma') \) and \( \Gamma(x) \preccurlyeq \Gamma(x) \), for any \( x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma) \). Then, the theorem follows from the fact that \( \preccurlyeq \) on type environments is reflexive. We start with a few lemmas about \( \preccurlyeq \).

**Lemma 24**

1. If \( T_1 \preccurlyeq T_1 \) and \( T_1 \vdash T_1 \rightarrow_m T_1 \), then there exist some \( T_{11}', T_{12}' \), and \( n \) such that \( \text{MATCHINGFUN}(T_1') = T_{11}' \rightarrow_n T_{12}' \) and \( T_{11}' \rightarrow_n T_{12} \preccurlyeq T_{11} \rightarrow_m T_{12} \).
2. If \( T_1 \preccurlyeq T_1 \) and \( T_1 \vdash T_1 \times_m T_1 \), then there exist some \( T_{11}', T_{12}' \), and \( n \) such that \( \text{MATCHINGPROD}(T_1') = T_{11}' \times_n T_{12}' \) and \( T_{11}' \times_n T_{12}' \preccurlyeq T_{11} \times_m T_{12} \).
3. If \( T_1 \preccurlyeq T_1 \) and \( T_1 \vdash ! T_1 \rightarrow T_{11} \rightarrow S_{12} \), then there exist some \( T_{11}' \) and \( S_{12}' \) such that \( \text{MATCHINGSEND}(T_1') = ! T_{11}' \rightarrow S_{12}' \) and \( ! T_{11} \rightarrow S_{12} \preccurlyeq ! T_{11} \rightarrow S_{12} \).
4. If \( T_1 \preccurlyeq T_1 \) and \( T_1 \vdash ? T_1 \rightarrow S_{12} \), then there exist some \( T_{11}' \) and \( S_{12}' \) such that \( \text{MATCHINGRECEIVE}(T_1') = ? T_{11}' \rightarrow S_{12}' \) and \( ? T_{11} \rightarrow S_{12} \preccurlyeq ? T_{11} \rightarrow S_{12} \).
5. If \( T_1 \preccurlyeq T_1 \) and \( T_1 \vdash \oplus \{ i : S_j \} \), then there exist some \( S_j' \) such that \( \text{MATCHINGSELECT}(T_1', i) = \oplus \{ i : S_j' \} \) and \( \oplus \{ i : S_j \} \preccurlyeq \oplus \{ i : S_j \} \).
6. If $T'_1 \lessapprox \Gamma$ and $T_1 \triangleright \{l_1 : S_1, \ldots, l_k : S_k\}$, then there exist some $S'_1, \ldots, S'_k$ such that $\text{MATCHINGCASE}(T'_1, \{l_1 \ldots l_k\}) = \& \{l_1 : S'_1, \ldots, l_k : S'_k\}$ and $\& \{l_1 : S'_1, \ldots, l_k : S'_k\} \lessapprox \Gamma$.

**Proof**

By case analysis on $T \triangleright U$.

**Lemma 25**

If $T \lessapprox U$ and $\text{un}(U)$, then $\text{un}(T)$.

**Proof**

By case analysis on $T \lessapprox U$.

**Lemma 26**

1. If $T_1 \lessapprox T_2$ and $T_2 \lessapprox T_3$, then $T_1 \lessapprox T_3$.
2. If $T_1 \lessapprox T_2$ and $T_2 \lessapprox T_3$, then $T_1 \lessapprox T_3$.

**Proof**

Both items are proved by simultaneous induction on $\lessapprox$.

**Lemma 27**

If $\Gamma \vdash e : T$ and $\Gamma' \lessapprox \Gamma$, then there exists $T'$ such that $\text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma', e) = T', X$ and $T' \lessapprox T$ and $\text{fv} (\Gamma) = X$.

**Proof**

By induction on $e$. We show main cases below.

**Case** $e = e_1 \& e_2$: By inversion, $\Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 : T_1$ and $\Gamma_2 \vdash e_2 : T_2$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \bowtie \Gamma_2$ and $T_1 \triangleright \\Gamma_1 \bowtie \Gamma_2$, $T_2 \lessapprox T_1$, for some $\Gamma_1$, $\Gamma_2$, $T_1$, $T_2$, $T_1$, $T_2$, $T_1$, $T_2$, $T_3$, and $m$. It is easy to show $\Gamma' \lessapprox \Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma' \lessapprox \Gamma_2$. By the induction hypothesis, for some $T_1'$, $T_2'$, $X$, and $Y$, $T_1' \bowtie T_2$ and $Y = \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma', e_1)$ and $T_2' \bowtie T_1$ and $\text{flv}(\Gamma_1) = X$ and $T_2' \bowtie T_2$ and $\text{flv}(\Gamma_2) = Y$. Since $\Gamma_1 \bowtie \Gamma_2$ is well defined, $X \cap Y$ must be $\emptyset$. By Lemma 24, $T_1' \bowtie \Gamma \vdash e_1 : T_1$, $T_2' \bowtie \Gamma \vdash e_2 : T_2$. It is easy to show $\Gamma' \lessapprox \Gamma_1 \bowtie \Gamma_2$ and $\Gamma' \lessapprox \Gamma_2 \bowtie \Gamma_1$. By the induction hypothesis, $T_1' \bowtie T_2'$ and $\text{flv}(\Gamma_1 \bowtie \Gamma_2) = \emptyset$.

**Case** $e = \text{case}_e (\{J \vdash x_j : e_j\})$: By inversion, we have $\Gamma_1 \vdash e_0 : T_0$ and $T_0 \triangleright \&\{\{J \vdash x_j : e_j\} : J\}$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \bowtie \Gamma_2$ for some $\Gamma_1$, $\Gamma_2$, $T_0$, and $U_j$ (for $j \in J$). It is easy to show $\Gamma' \lessapprox \Gamma_1 \bowtie \Gamma_2$ and $\Gamma' \lessapprox \Gamma_2 \bowtie \Gamma_1$. By the induction hypothesis, $T_0' \bowtie X = \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma', e_0)$ and $T_0' \bowtie T_0$ and $\text{flv}(\Gamma_1) = X$ for some $T_0'$ and $X$. By Lemma 24, $\text{MATCHINGCASE}(T_0' \bowtie \Gamma_1 \bowtie \Gamma_2) = \& \{\{J \vdash x_j : e_j\} : J\}$ and $\& \{\{J \vdash x_j : e_j\} : J\}$ and $\& \{\{J \vdash x_j : e_j\} : J\}$ and $\& \{\{J \vdash x_j : e_j\} : J\}$ and $\& \{\{J \vdash x_j : e_j\} : J\}$ and $\& \{\{J \vdash x_j : e_j\} : J\}$ and $\& \{\{J \vdash x_j : e_j\} : J\}$. By inversion of $\lessapprox$, we have $\& \{\{J \vdash x_j : e_j\} : J\}$ and $\& \{\{J \vdash x_j : e_j\} : J\}$. By the induction hypothesis, for any $j \in J$, there exist $U'_j$, $Y_j$ such that $U'_j, Y_j = \text{CHECKEXPR}(\Gamma', x_j : R_j, e_j)$ and $U'_j \bowtie U_j$ and $\text{flv}(\Gamma_2, x_j : R_j) = Y_j$. It is easy to show that $x_j \in Y_j$ for any $j \in J$ and $Y_j = \emptyset$ because $R_j$ is linear and $\Gamma_1 \bowtie \Gamma_2$ is well defined. It is also easy to show $X \cup \{Y_j \setminus \{x_j\}\} = \text{flv}(\Gamma)$ because $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \bowtie \Gamma_2$. Finally, $U'_j, Y_j \bowtie \Gamma_1 \bowtie \Gamma_2$ is shown by Lemma 17.