

Featherweight Go

ROBERT GRIESEMER, Google, USA

RAYMOND HU, University of Hertfordshire, UK

WEN KOKKE, University of Edinburgh, UK

JULIEN LANGE, Royal Holloway, University of London, UK

IAN LANCE TAYLOR, Google, USA

BERNARDO TONINHO, NOVA-LINCS, FCT-NOVA, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal

PHILIP WADLER, University of Edinburgh, UK

NOBUKO YOSHIDA, Imperial College London, UK

We describe a design for generics in Go inspired by previous work on Featherweight Java by Igarashi, Pierce, and Wadler. Whereas subtyping in Java is nominal, in Go it is structural, and whereas generics in Java are defined via erasure, in Go we use monomorphisation. Although monomorphisation is widely used, we are one of the first to formalise it. Our design also supports a solution to The Expression Problem.

CCS Concepts: • **Theory of computation** → **Program semantics; Type structures**; • **Software and its engineering** → **Polymorphism**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Go, Generics, Monomorphisation

1 INTRODUCTION

Google introduced the Go programming language in 2009 [Griesemer et al. 2009; The Go Team 2020]. Today it sits at position 12 on the Tiobe Programming Language Index and position 10 on the IEEE Spectrum Programming Language Ranking (Haskell sits at positions 41 and 29, respectively). Recently, the Go team mooted a design to extend Go with generics [Taylor and Griesemer 2019], and Rob Pike wrote Wadler to ask:

Would you be interested in helping us get polymorphism right (and/or figuring out what “right” means) for some future version of Go?

This paper is our response to that question.

Two decades ago, Igarashi, Pierce, and Wadler [1999; 2001], introduced Featherweight Java. They considered a tiny model of Java (FJ), extended that model with generics (FGJ), and translated FGJ to FJ (via *erasure*). In their footsteps, we introduce Featherweight Go. We consider a tiny model of Go (FG), extend that model with generics (FGG), and translate FGG to FG (via *monomorphisation*).

Authors’ addresses: Robert Griesemer, Google, USA; Raymond Hu, University of Hertfordshire, School of Engineering and Computer Science, Hatfield, UK, r.z.h.hu@herts.ac.uk; Wen Kokke, University of Edinburgh, Laboratory for Foundations of Computer Science, Edinburgh, UK, wen.kokke@ed.ac.uk; Julien Lange, Royal Holloway, University of London, Department of Computer Science, Egham, UK, julien.lange@rhul.ac.uk; Ian Lance Taylor, Google, USA; Bernardo Toninho, Departamento de Informática, NOVA-LINCS, FCT-NOVA, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal, btoninho@fct.unl.pt; Philip Wadler, University of Edinburgh, School of Informatics, Edinburgh, UK, wadler@inf.ed.ac.uk; Nobuko Yoshida, Imperial College London, Computing, London, UK, n.yoshida@imperial.ac.uk.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

© 2020 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

2475-1421/2020/11-ART149

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3428217>

Go differs in interesting ways from Java. Subtyping in Java is nominal, whereas in Go it is structural. Casts in Java correspond to type assertions in Go: casts in Java with generics are restricted to support erasure, whereas type assertions in Go with generics are unrestricted thanks to monomorphisation. Monomorphisation is widely used, but we are among the first to formalise it. The Expression Problem was first formulated by Wadler [1998] in the context of Java, though Java never supported a solution; our design does.

We provide a full formal development: for FG and FGG, type and reduction rules, and preservation and progress; for monomorphisation, a formal translation from FGG to FG that preserves types and is a bisimulation. The appendices contain complete proofs.

Structural subtyping. Go is based on structures and interface types. Whereas most programming languages use *nominal subtyping*, Go is unique among mainstream typed programming languages in using *structural subtyping*. A structure implements an interface if it defines all the methods specified by that interface, and an interface implements another if the methods of the first are a superset of the methods specified by the second.

In Java, the superclasses of a class are fixed by the declaration. If lists are defined before collections, then one cannot retrofit collections as a superclass of lists—save by rewriting and recompiling the entire library. In Haskell the superclasses of a type class are fixed by the declaration. If monads are defined before functors, then one cannot retrofit functors as a superclass of monads—save by rewriting and recompiling the entire library. In contrast, in Go one might define lists or monads first, and later introduce collections or functors as an interface that the former implements—without rewriting or recompiling the earlier code.

The Expression Problem. The Expression Problem was formulated by Wadler [1998]. It gave a name to issues described by Cook [1990], Reynolds [1994], and Krishnamurthi et al. [1998], and became the basis of subsequent work by Torgersen [2004], Zenger and Odersky [2004], Swierstra [2008], and many others. Wadler defines The Expression Problem this way:

The goal is to define a data type by cases, where one can add new cases to the data type and new functions over the data type, without recompiling existing code, and while retaining static type safety.

And motivates its interest as follows:

Whether a language can solve the Expression Problem is a salient indicator of its capacity for expression. One can think of cases as rows and functions as columns in a table. In a functional language, the rows are fixed (cases in a datatype declaration) but it is easy to add new columns (functions). In an object-oriented language, the columns are fixed (methods in a class declaration) but it is easy to add new rows (subclasses).

We want to make it easy to add either rows or columns.

One can come close to solving The Expression Problem in Go as it exists now, using dynamic checking via type assertions. We show how to provide a fully static solution with generics. We had to adjust our design: our first design for generics used nonvariant matching on bounds in receivers of methods, but to solve The Expression Problem we had to relax this to covariant matching.

Monomorphisation. FGJ translates to FJ via *erasure*, whereas FGG translates to FG via *monomorphisation*. Two instances `List<int>` and `List<bool>` in FGJ both translate to `List` in FJ (where `<>` are punctuation), whereas two instances `List(int)` and `List(bool)` in FGG translate to separate types `List<int>` and `List<bool>` in FG (where `()` are punctuation, but `<>` are taken as part of the name).

Erasure is more restrictive than monomorphisation. In Java with generics, a cast `(a)x` is illegal if `a` is a type variable, whereas in Go with generics, the equivalent type assertion `x.(a)` is permitted.

Erasure is often less efficient than monomorphisation. In Java with generics, all type variables are boxed, whereas in Go with generics type variables may instantiate to be unboxed. However, erasure is linear in the size of the code, whereas monomorphisation can suffer an exponential blowup; and erasure is suited to separate compilation, whereas monomorphisation requires the whole program. We choose to look at monomorphisation in the first instance, because it is simple, efficient, and the first design looked at by the Go team. Other designs offer other tradeoffs, e.g., the restriction on a type assertion $x.(a)$ could also be avoided by passing runtime representations of types. This solution avoids exponential blowup and offers better support for separate compilation, but at a cost in efficiency and complexity. We expect the final solution will involve a mix of both monomorphisation and runtime representations of types, see Section 8 for more details.

Template expansion in C++ [Stroustrup 2013, Chapter 26] corresponds to monomorphisation. Generics in .NET are implemented by a mixture of erasure and monomorphisation [Kennedy and Syme 2001]. The MLton compiler for Standard ML [Cejtin et al. 2000] and the Rust programming language [The Rust Team 2017] both apply techniques closely related to monomorphisation, as described by Fluett [2015] and Turon [2015] on web pages and blog posts. We say more about related work in Section 7, but we have found only a handful of peer-reviewed publications that touch on formalisation of monomorphisation. Monomorphisation is possible only when it requires a finite set of instances of types and methods. We believe we are the first to formalise computation of instance sets and determination of whether they are finite.

The bookkeeping required to formalise monomorphisation of instances and methods is not trivial. Monomorphising an interface with type parameters that contains a method with type parameters may require different instances of the interfaces to contain different instances of the methods. It took us several tries over many months to formalise it correctly. While the method for monomorphisation described here is specialised to Go, we expect it to be of wider interest, since similar issues arise for other languages and compilers such as C++, .Net, MLton, or Rust.

Featherweight vs complete. A reviewer of an earlier revision of this paper wrote:

It is also quite common for semantics to strive for “completeness”, instead of being “featherweight”. There is a lot of value in having featherweight semantics, but the argument for completeness is that it helps language designers understand bad interactions between features. (For example, Amin and Tate [2016] recently showed that Java generics are unsound, but the bug is beyond the scope of Featherweight Generic Java.)

We agree with these words. Since the review was a reject, we deduce an implicit claim that it is better to be complete. Here, with respect, we disagree. We argue both “featherweight” and “complete” descriptions have value. As evidence, compare citations counts for the paper on Featherweight Java, Igarashi et al. [2001], with the four most-cited papers on more complete models, Drossopoulou and Eisenbach [1997]; Flatt et al. [1998]; Nipkow and von Oheimb [1998]; Syme [1999]: 1070 as compared with 549, 248, 174, 158, respectively (Google Scholar, April 2020).

Impact. The original proposal for generics in Go [Taylor and Griesemer 2019] was based on *contracts*, which are syntactically convenient but lack a clear semantics. One result of our work is that the new proposal [Taylor and Griesemer 2020] is based on *interfaces*, which are already well defined in Go. After we submitted the draft of this paper, Griesemer wrote to Wadler:

I want to thank you and your team for all the type theory work on Go so far—it really helped clarify our understanding to a massive degree. So thanks!

Another result is the proposal for covariant receiver typing, a feature required by The Expression Problem. It is not part of the Go team's current design, but they have noted it is backward compatible and are considering adding it in the future.

In this paper we adopt the syntax originally proposed by the Go team in July 2019 [Taylor and Griesemer 2019]. In September 2020 [Taylor and Griesemer 2020], they proposed a revised syntax where type parameters are declared within square brackets and the **type** keyword is omitted. We prefer the new syntax, but retained the old since our artifact uses the old syntax and artifact evaluation was already complete.

Outline. Section 2 introduces FG and FGG, presents a solution to The Expression Problem, and introduces monomorphisation. Sections 3 and 4 present FG and FGG; we give formal rules for types and reductions, and prove preservation and progress. Section 5 presents monomorphisation, which translates FGG back to FG; we prove the translation preserves types and is a bisimulation. Section 6 describes our prototype implementation. Section 7 describes related work. Section 8 concludes. Appendices provide extra examples and details of all proofs.

2 FEATHERWEIGHT GO BY EXAMPLE

Formally, FG and FGG are tiny languages, containing only structures, interfaces, and methods. Our examples use features of Go missing in FG and FGG, including booleans, integers, strings, and variable bindings. We show how to declare booleans in FG and FGG in Appendices A.1 and A.2.

2.1 FG by example

Functions in FG. Figure 1 shows higher-order functions in FG.

Interface `Any` has no methods, and so is implemented by any type. Interface `Function` has a single method, `Apply(x Any) Any`, which has an argument and result of type `Any`. It is implemented by any structure that defines a method with the same name and same signature. In Go structures and methods are declared separately, as compared to Java where they are grouped together in a class declaration. We give three examples.

Structure `incr` has a single field, `n`, of type `int`. Its `Apply` method has receiver `this` of type `incr`, argument `x` of type `Any`, and result type `Any`, and increments its argument by `n`. You might expect the argument and result to instead have type `int`, but then the declared method would not implement the `Function` interface, because the method name and signature must match exactly. In the method's body, `x.(int)` is a *type assertion* that checks its argument is an integer; otherwise it *panics*, which is Go jargon for raising a runtime error. A structure is created by a *literal*, consisting of the structure name and its field values in braces. For instance, `incr{-5}.Apply(3)` returns `-2`. A field of a structure is accessed in the usual way, `this.n`. Here `this` is a variable bound to the receiver, not a keyword.

Structure `pos` has no fields, and its `apply` method returns `true` if given a positive integer. Structure `compose` has two fields, each of which is a function, and its `apply` method applies the two in succession. The top-level `main` method composes `incr{-5}` with `pos{}` and applies it to `3`, yielding `false`. One cannot pass a value of type `Any` where a boolean is expected, so the type assertion `.(bool)` is required.

Bound variable names are irrelevant when comparing method signatures, but method names and type names must match exactly. For example, the following signatures are considered equivalent:

`Apply(x Any) Any`

`Apply(arg Any) Any`

Equality in FG. Figure 2 shows equality in FG.

Interface `Eq` has one method with signature `Equal(that Eq) bool`. If a type implements this interface we say it supports equality.

```

type Any interface {}
type Function interface {
  Apply(x Any) Any
}
type incr struct { n int }
func (this incr) Apply(x Any) Any {
  return x.(int) + this.n
}
type pos struct {}
func (this pos) Apply(x Any) Any {
  return x.(int) > 0
}

type compose struct {
  f Function
  g Function
}
func (this compose) Apply(x Any) Any {
  return this.g.Apply(this.f.Apply(x))
}
func main() {
  var f Function = compose{incr{-5},pos{}}
  var _ bool = f.Apply(3).(bool) // false
}

```

Fig. 1. Functions in FG

```

type Eq interface {
  Equal(that Eq) bool
}
type Int int
func (this Int) Equal(that Eq) bool {
  return this == that.(Int)
}
type Pair struct {
  left Eq
  right Eq
}

func (this Pair) Equal(that Eq) bool {
  return this.left.Equal(that.(Pair).left) &&
    this.right.Equal(that.(Pair).right)
}
func main() {
  var i, j Int = 1, 2
  var p Pair = Pair{i, j}
  var _ bool = p.Equal(p) // true
}

```

Fig. 2. Equality in FG

```

type List interface {
  Map(f Function) List
}
type Nil struct {}
type Cons struct {
  head Any
  tail List
}
func (xs Nil) Map(f Function) List {
  return Nil{}
}

func (xs Cons) Map(f Function) List {
  return Cons{f.Apply(xs.head), xs.tail.Map(f)}
}
func main() {
  var xs List = Cons{3, Cons{6, Nil{}}}
  var ys List = xs.Map(incr{-5})
  // Cons{-2, Cons{1, Nil{}}}
  var _ List = ys.Map(pos{})
  // Cons{false, Cons{true, Nil{}}}
}

```

Fig. 3. Lists in FG

A type declaration introduces `Int` as a synonym for integers, and a method declaration ensures that type supports equality. Since signatures must match exactly, in the method the argument has type `Eq` and the body uses a type assertion to convert it to `Int` as required.

A second type declaration introduces the structure `Pair` with two fields `left` and `right` which may be of any type that supports equality, and the method declaration ensures that pairs themselves support equality. Again, the argument has type `Eq` and the body uses a type assertion to convert it to a `Pair` as required. The top level `main` method builds a pair of integers and compares it to itself for equality, yielding `true`.

Since pairs are to support equality, their components are also required to support equality. In general, if a structure is to satisfy some interface we may need to require that each field of that structure satisfies the same interface—a property we refer to as *type pollution*. An alternative design would give fields the type `Any`, and to replace `this.left` by `this.left.(Eq)`, and similarly for the other component. The alternative design is more flexible—it permits fields of the pair to have any type—but is less efficient (the type assertions must be checked at runtime) and less reliable (the type assertions may fail). As we will see, FGG will let us avoid type pollution, providing flexibility, efficiency, and reliability all at the same time.

Lists in FG. Figure 3 shows lists in FG.

Interface `List` has a single method: `Map(f Function) List`, which applies its argument to each element of its receiver. We define two structures that implement the list interface. Structure `Nil` has no fields, while structure `Cons` has two fields, a head of any type and a tail which is a list. The methods to define `Map` are straightforward, and the main method shows an example of its use.

Go is designed to enable efficient implementation. Structures are laid out in memory as a sequence of fields, while an interface is a pair of a pointer to an underlying structure and a pointer to a dictionary of methods. To ensure the layout of a structure is finite, a structure that recurses on itself is forbidden. Thus, the declaration

```
type Bad struct { oops Bad }
```

is not allowed, and similarly for mutual recursion. However, structures that recurse through an interface are permitted, such as

```
type Cons struct { head Any; tail List }
```

where the `tail` field of type `List` may itself contain a `Cons`, since `Cons` implements interface `List`.

2.2 FGG by Example

We now adapt the examples of the previous section to generics.

Functions in FGG. Figure 4 shows higher-order functions in FGG.

The interface for functions now takes two type parameters, `Function(type a Any, b Any)`. Each type parameter is followed by an interface it must implement, called its *bound*. Here the bounds indicate that the argument and result may be of any type. The signature for the method is now `Apply(x a) b`, where the first type parameter is the argument type and the second the result type.

Structures `incr` and `pos` are as before. However, they now have more natural signatures for their apply methods, where all occurrences of `Any` are replaced by `int` or `bool` as appropriate. Type assertions in the method bodies are no longer needed, and the types ensure a panic never occurs.

The structure for composition now takes three type parameters. In the `main` method, type parameters are added and the type assertion at the end is no longer required.

Equality in FGG. Figure 5 shows equality in FGG.

The interface for equality is now written `Eq(type a Eq(a))`. It accepts a type parameter `a` where the bound is itself `Eq(a)`. The method has signature `Equal(that a) bool`. The situation where a type parameter appears in its own bound is known as *F-bounded polymorphism* [Canning et al. 1989], and a similar idiom is common in Java with generics [Bracha et al. 1998; Naftalin and Wadler 2006].

Since we use a type parameter for the argument to `Equal`, in the method declaration for `Int` the argument must now have type `Int` instead of type `Eq`. A type assertion in the method body is no longer required, increasing efficiency and reliability.

```

type Function(type a Any, b Any) interface {
  Apply(x a) b
}
type incr struct { n int }
func (this incr) Apply(x int) int {
  return x + this.n
}
type pos struct {}
func (this pos) Apply(x int) bool {
  return x > 0
}

type compose(type a Any, b Any, c Any) struct {
  f Function(a, b)
  g Function(b, c)
}
func (this compose(type a Any, b Any, c Any))
  Apply(x a) c {
  return this.g.Apply(this.f.Apply(x))
}
func main() {
  var f Function(int, bool) =
    compose(int, int, bool){incr{-5}, pos{}}
  var _ bool = f.Apply(3) // false
}

```

Fig. 4. Functions in FGG

```

type Eq(type a Eq(a)) interface {
  Equal(that a) bool
}
type Int int
func (this Int) Equal(that Int) bool {
  return this == that
}
type Pair(type a Any, b Any) struct {
  left a
  right b
}

func (this Pair(type a Eq(a), b Eq(b)))
  Equal(that Pair(a,b)) bool {
  return this.left.Equal(that.left) &&
    this.right.Equal(that.right)
}
func main() {
  var i, j Int = 1, 2
  var p Pair(Int, Int) = Pair(Int, Int){i, j}
  var _ bool = p.Equal(p) // true
}

```

Fig. 5. Equality in FGG

```

type List(type a Any) interface {
  Map(type b Any)(f Function(a, b)) List(b)
}
type Nil(type a Any) struct {}
type Cons(type a Any) struct {
  head a
  tail List(a)
}
func (xs Nil(type a Any))
  Map(type b Any)(f Function(a,b)) List(b) {
  return Nil(b){}
}

func (xs Cons(type a Any))
  Map(type b Any)(f Function(a,b)) List(b) {
  return Cons(b)
    {f.Apply(xs.head), xs.tail.Map(b)(f)}
}
func main() {
  var xs List(int) =
    Cons(int){3, Cons(int){6, Nil(int){}}}
  var ys List(int) = xs.Map(int)(incr{-5})
  var _ List(bool) = ys.Map(bool)(pos{})
}

```

Fig. 6. Lists in FGG

```

type Edge(type e Edge(e,v),
  v Vertex(e,v)) interface {
  Source() v
  Target() v
}

type Vertex(e Edge(e,v),
  v Vertex(e,v)) interface {
  Edges() List(e)
}

```

Fig. 7. Mutually recursive bounds

The type declaration for `Pair` now take two type parameters, `a` and `b`, which are both bounded by `Any`. The method declaration for equality on pairs also uses two type parameters, `a` and `b`, bounded by `Eq(a)` and `Eq(b)` respectively, so the call to `Equality` on the components of the pair is permitted.

Crucially, FGG permits the bounds on the type parameter in a receiver to *implement* the bound on the type parameter in the corresponding structure declaration (receiver type parameters are *covariant*). This is in contrast to method signatures, which must exactly match the signature in the interface (signatures are *nonvariant*). In this case, the bounds on `a` and `b` in the type declaration for pairs are both `Any`, while the bounds on `a` and `b` in the receiver are `Eq(a)` and `Eq(b)`. By covariance, since `Eq(a)` and `Eq(b)` implement `Any`, the method declaration is allowed.

The Go team's current design does not support covariant receiver typing. Instead, receivers are nonvariant, just like method signatures. With that design, the bounds on `a` and `b` in the declaration for pairs must exactly match those in the method receiver. Either the type and method declarations must both use bounds `Eq(a)` and `Eq(b)` (in which case one cannot have pairs where the components do not support equality, even if don't need that pair to itself support equality, reintroducing type pollution and reducing flexibility), or they must both use bounds `Any` (in which case the method body will need to add type assertions to `Eq(a)` and `Eq(b)`, reducing efficiency and reliability).

Lists in FGG. Figure 6 shows lists in FGG.

Interface `List` now takes as a parameter the type of the elements of the list, bounded by `Any`. The signature for the `map` method is now `Map(type b Any)(f Function(a, b)) List(b)`. The list interface takes a parameter `a` for the type of elements of the receiver list, while the `map` method itself takes an additional parameter `b` for the type of elements of the result list.

The two structures that implement lists now also take a type parameter, again bounded by `Any`. It may seem odd that `Nil` requires a parameter, since it represents a list with no elements. However, without this parameter we could not declare that `Nil` has method `Map`, whose signature mentions the type of the list elements.

The main method simply adds type parameters. In Go, no name can be bound to both a value and a type in a given scope, so it is always unambiguous as to whether one is parsing a type or an expression. In practice, writing out all type parameters in full can be tedious, and generic Go permits such parameters to be omitted when they can be inferred. Here we always require type parameters, leaving inference for future work.

Type parameter names and variable names are irrelevant when comparing method signatures, but method names, bounds on type parameters, and type names must match exactly. For example, the following two signatures are considered equivalent:

```
Map(type b Any)(f Function(a, b)) List(b)    Map(type bob Any)(fred Function(a, bob)) List(bob)
```

If we wanted to define equality on lists without type assertions, we would need to bound the elements of the list so that they support equality, changing every occurrence of `(type a Any)`, in the code to `(type a Eq(a))`, and similarly for `b` in the signature of `Map`. This is a form of type pollution. An alternative design that avoids pollution, based on our solution to The Expression Problem, can be found in Appendix A.3.

Mutual recursion in type bounds. In a declaration that introduces a list of type parameters, the bounds of each may refer to any of the others. Figure 7 shows two mutually-recursive interface declarations that may be useful in representing graphs. It is parameterised over types for edges and vertexes. Each edge has a source and target vertex, while each vertex has a list of edges.

```

// Eval on Num
type Evaluator interface {
    Eval() int
}
type Num struct {
    value int
}
func (e Num) Eval() int {
    return e.value
}
// Eval on Plus
type Plus(type a Any) struct {
    left a
    right a
}
func (e Plus(type a Evaluator)) Eval() int {
    return e.left.Eval() + e.right.Eval()
}

// String on Num
type Stringer interface {
    String() string
}
func (e Num) String() string {
    return fmt.Sprintf("%d", e.value)
}
// String on Plus
func (e Plus(type a Stringer)) String() string {
    return fmt.Sprintf("(%s+%s)",
        e.left.String(), e.right.String())
}
// tie it all together
type Expr interface {
    Evaluator
    Stringer
}
func main() {
    var e Expr = Plus(Expr){Num{1}, Num{2}}
    var _ Int = e.Eval() // 3
    var _ string = e.String() // "(1+2)"
}

```

Fig. 8. Expression problem in FGG

2.3 The Expression Problem

Following [Wadler \[1998\]](#), we present The Expression Problem pared to a minimum. Our solution appears in Figure 8. There are just two structures that construct expressions, `Num` and `Plus`, which denote numbers and the sum of two expressions, respectively; and two methods that operate on expressions, `Eval` and `String`, which evaluate an expression and convert it to a string, respectively. We show that each constructor and operation can be added independently, proceeding in four steps:

- | | |
|---|---|
| (1) define <code>Eval</code> on <code>Num</code> | (3) define <code>String</code> on <code>Num</code> |
| (2) define <code>Eval</code> on <code>Plus</code> | (4) define <code>String</code> on <code>Plus</code> |

The order of steps 2 and 3 can be reversed: we may extend either by adding a new constructor or a new operation. We assume availability of the library function `fmt.Sprintf` to format strings.

Structure `Num` contains an integer value. Structure `Plus` contains two fields, `left` and `right`, which are themselves expressions. Typically, we might expect the type of these fields to be an interface specifying all operations we wish to perform on expressions. But the whole point of the expression problem is that we may add other operations later! Thus, `plus` takes a type parameter for the type of these fields. We bound the type parameter with `Any`, permitting it to be instantiated by any type.

For each operation, `Eval` and `String`, we define a corresponding interface to specify that operation, `Evaluator` and `Stringer`. (The naming convention is typical of Go.) When defining `Eval` on `Plus`, the receiver's type parameter is bounded by interface `Evaluator`, allowing `Eval` to be recursively invoked on the left and right expressions. Similarly, when defining `String` on `Plus`, the receiver's type parameter is bounded by interface `Stringer`, allowing `String` to be recursively invoked. Note this depends crucially on FGG's support for covariant receivers in method declarations. Since the bounds or the receivers in the method declarations, `Evaluator` and `Stringer`, implement the bounds in the type declarations, `Any`, the method declarations are allowed.

A last step shows how to tie it all together. We define an interface `Expr` embedding `Evaler` and `Stringer`, and show how to build an `Expr` value which we can both evaluate and convert to a string.

How close could we get without generics? If we know all operations in advance, then in place of the type parameter in `Plus` we can use interface `Expr`, defining all required operations; but that violates the requirement that we can add operations later. Alternatively, in place of the type parameter in `Plus` we can use interface `Any`, with type assertions to `Evaler` or `Stringer` before the recursive calls; that allows us to add operations later, but violates the requirement that all types be checked statically.

2.4 Monomorphisation by example

We translate FGG into FG via *monomorphisation*. As an example, consider the FGG code in Figures 4 and 6. We only include the code relevant to the main method, so omit composition and equality. The given code monomorphises to the FG program shown in Figure 9.

Each parametric type and method in FGG is translated to a family of types and methods in FG, one for each possible instantiation of the type parameters. FGG type `List(a)` is instantiated at types `int` and `bool`, so it translates to the two FG types `List<int>` and `List<bool>`. For convenience, we assume that angle brackets and commas “<,>” may appear in FG identifiers, although that is not allowed in Go. In our prototype, we use Unicode letters that resemble angle brackets and a dash: Canadian Syllabics Pa (U+1438), Po (U+1433), and Final Short Horizontal Stroke (U+1428).

Monomorphisation tracks for each method the possible types of its receiver and type parameters. In this particular program, we need two instances of `Map` over lists of integers, one that yields a list of integers and one that yields a list of booleans, and none for `Map` over lists of booleans.

Each interface also contains an instance of a *dummy* version of `Apply` or `Map`, here called, e.g., `Map<2>`, where the number in brackets stands for a hash computed from the method signature. A dummy method is provided for every source FGG method; these dummy methods are needed to ensure a correct implementation relation between structures and interfaces is maintained at runtime. For instance, if `f` is bound to `incr{1}` then the type assertion `f.(List<bool>)` should fail; but without the dummy, interface `List<bool>` would have no methods and hence any structure or interface would implement it.

Monomorphisation yields specialised type declarations for structures and interfaces, and specialised method declarations, plus the required dummy methods. The source FGG and its translation to FG are both well-typed, and both evaluate to corresponding terms: we will show the translation preserves typing and is a bisimulation.

Not all typable FGG source can be monomorphised. Figure 10 shows a program that exhibits *polymorphic recursion*, where a method called at one type recursively calls itself at a different type. Here, calling method `Nest` on a receiver of type `Box(a)` leads to a recursive call on a receiver of type `Box(Box(a))`. Monomorphisation is impossible because we cannot determine in advance to what depth the types will nest. We will present a theorem stating that if source code does not exhibit problematic polymorphic recursion then it can be monomorphised.

3 FEATHERWEIGHT GO

3.1 FG syntax

Figure 11 presents FG syntax. We let f range over field names, m range over method names, x range over variable names, t_s, u_s range over structure names, and t_I, u_I range over interface names.

```

type Top struct {}
type Function<int,int> interface {
  Apply<0> Top
  Apply(x int) int
}
type incr struct { n int }
func (this incr) Apply<0> Top {
  return Top{}
}
func (this incr) Apply(x int) int {
  return x + this.n
}
type Function<int,bool> interface {
  Apply<1> Top
  Apply(x int) bool
}
type pos struct {}
func (this pos) Apply<1> Top {
  return Top{}
}
func (this pos) Apply(x int) bool {
  return x > 0
}
type List<int> interface {
  Map<2>() Top
  Map<int>(f Function<int,int>) List<int>
  Map<bool>(f Function<int,bool>) List<bool>
}
type Nil<int> struct {}
type Cons<int> struct {
  head int
  tail List<int>
}
func (xs Nil<int>) Map<2>() Top {
  return Top{}
}
func (xs Cons<int>) Map<2>() Top {
  return Top{}
}

func (xs Nil<int>)
  Map<int>(f Function<int,int>) List<int> {
    return Nil<int>{}
  }
func (xs Cons<int>)
  Map<int>(f Function<int,int>) List<int> {
    return Cons<int>
      {f.Apply(xs.head), xs.tail.Map<int>(f)}
  }
func (xs Nil<int>)
  Map<bool>(f Function<int,bool>) List<bool> {
    return Nil<bool>{}
  }
func (xs Cons<int>)
  Map<bool>(f Function<int,bool>) List<bool> {
    return Cons<bool>
      {f.Apply(xs.head), xs.tail.Map<bool>(f)}
  }
type List<bool> interface {
  Map<3>() Top
}
type Nil<bool> struct {}
type Cons<bool> struct {
  head bool
  tail List<bool>
}
func (xs Nil<bool>) Map<3>() Top {
  return Top{}
}
func (xs Cons<bool>) Map<3>() Top {
  return Top{}
}
func main() {
  var xs List<int> =
    Cons<int>{3, Cons<int>{6, Nil<int>}}
  var ys List<int> = xs.Map<int>(incr{-5})
  var _ List<bool> = ys.Map<bool>(pos{})
}

```

Fig. 9. Monomorphisation: example of FG translation

```

type Box(type a Any) struct {
  value a
}

func (this Box(type a Any)) Nest(n int) Any {
  if (n == 0) { return this }
  else { return Box(Box(a)){this}.Nest(n-1) }
}

```

Fig. 10. FGG code that cannot be monomorphised

Field name	f	Expression	$d, e ::=$
Method name	m	Variable	x
Variable name	x	Method call	$e.m(\bar{e})$
Structure type name	t_S, u_S	Structure literal	$t_S\{\bar{e}\}$
Interface type name	t_I, u_I	Select	$e.f$
Type name	$t, u ::= t_S \mid t_I$	Type assertion	$e.(t)$
Method signature	$M ::= (\bar{x} \bar{t}) t$		
Method specification	$S ::= mM$		
Type Literal	$T ::=$		
Structure	struct $\{\bar{f} \bar{t}\}$		
Interface	interface $\{\bar{S}\}$		
Declaration	$D ::=$		
Type declaration	type $t T$		
Method declaration	func $(x t_S) mM \{\text{return } e\}$		
Program	$P ::= \text{package main; } \bar{D} \text{ func main() } \{ _ = e \}$		

Fig. 11. FG syntax

We let t, u range over type names, which are either structure or interface type names. We let d and e range over expressions, which have five forms: variable x , method call $e.m(\bar{e})$, structure literal $t_S\{\bar{e}\}$, selection $e.f$, and type assertion $e.(t)$. By convention, \bar{e} stands for the sequence e_1, \dots, e_n . We consider e and \bar{e} to be distinct metavariables.

A method signature M has the form $(\bar{x} \bar{t}) t$. Here \bar{x} stands for x_1, \dots, x_n and \bar{t} stands for t_1, \dots, t_n , and hence $\bar{x} \bar{t}$ stands for $x_1 t_1, \dots, x_n t_n$. We use similar conventions extensively.

A method specification S is a method name followed by a method signature. A type literal T is either a structure **struct** $\{\bar{f} \bar{t}\}$ or an interface **interface** $\{\bar{S}\}$. A declaration D is either a type declaration **type** $t T$ or a method declaration **func** $(x t_S) mM \{\text{return } e\}$. In our examples, interface declarations may contain interface embeddings, i.e., a reference to another interface; for our formalism, we assume these are always expanded out to the corresponding method specifications.

A program P consists of a sequence of declarations \bar{D} and a top-level expression e , written in the stylised form shown in the figure to make it legal Go. We sometimes abbreviate it as $\bar{D} \triangleright e$.

3.2 Auxiliary functions

Figure 12 presents several auxiliary definitions. All definitions assume a given program with a fixed sequence of declarations \bar{D} .

Function $fields(t_S)$ looks up the structure declaration for t_S and returns a sequence $(\bar{f} \bar{t})$ of field names and their types. Write $t_S.m$ to refer to the method declaration with receiver type t_S and name m . Function $body(t_S.m)$ returns $(x : t_S, \bar{x} : \bar{t}).e$, where $x : t_S$ is the receiver parameter and its type, $\bar{x} : \bar{t}$ the argument parameters and their types, and e the body from the declaration of a method with receiver of type t_S and name m . In the phrase **func** $(x t_S) m(\bar{x} \bar{t}) t$, each of t_S, \bar{t} , and t is considered a distinct metavariable, and similarly for x and \bar{x} .

Function $type(\bar{v})$ is explained in Section 3.4. Predicate $unique(\bar{S})$ holds if for every method specification mM in \bar{S} the method name m uniquely determines the method signature M .

Function $tdecls(\bar{D})$ returns a sequence with the name of every type declared in \bar{D} . Function $mdecls(\bar{D})$ returns a sequence with a pair $t_S.m$ for every method declared in \bar{D} . Predicate $distinct$, not defined in the figure, takes a sequence, and holds if no item in the sequence is duplicated.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{(\mathbf{type} \ t_S \ \mathbf{struct}\{\overline{f} \ t\}) \in \overline{D}}{\mathit{fields}(t_S) = \overline{f} \ t} \qquad \frac{(\mathbf{func} \ (x \ t_S) \ m(\overline{x} \ t) \ t \ \{\mathbf{return} \ e\}) \in \overline{D}}{\mathit{body}(t_S.m) = (x : t_S, \overline{x} : t).e} \\
\\
\mathit{type}(t_S\{\overline{v}\}) = t_S \qquad \frac{mM_1, mM_2 \in \overline{S} \text{ implies } M_1 = M_2}{\mathit{unique}(\overline{S})} \\
\\
\mathit{tdecls}(\overline{D}) = [t \mid (\mathbf{type} \ t \ T) \in \overline{D}] \qquad \mathit{mdecls}(\overline{D}) = [t_S.m \mid (\mathbf{func} \ (x \ t_S) \ mM \ \{\mathbf{return} \ e\}) \in \overline{D}] \\
\\
\mathit{methods}(t_S) = \{mM \mid (\mathbf{func} \ (x \ t_S) \ mM \ \{\mathbf{return} \ e\}) \in \overline{D}\} \qquad \frac{\mathbf{type} \ t_I \ \mathbf{interface}\{\overline{S}\} \in \overline{D}}{\mathit{methods}(t_I) = \overline{S}}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 12. FG auxiliary functions

We are careful to distinguish between sets and sequences. Predicate *distinct* must take a sequence rather than a set, because items in a set are distinct by definition. Sequences may implicitly coerce to sets, but not vice-versa. When comparing method signatures, the names of formal parameters are ignored; signatures are considered equal if they contain the same types in the same sequence.

Function $\mathit{methods}(t)$ returns the set of all method specifications belonging to type t . If t is a structure type the method specifications are those from the method declarations with a receiver of the given type. If t is an interface type, the method specifications are those given in the interface.

Figure 13 presents the FG typing rules. Let Γ range over environments, which are sequences of variables paired with type names, $x : t$. We write \emptyset for the empty environment.

Judgement $t <: u$ holds if type t implements type u . A structure type t_S is only implemented by itself, while type t implements interface type t_I if the methods defined on t are a superset of those defined on t_I . It follows from the definition that $<:$ is reflexive and transitive.

3.3 FG Typing

We write *ok* to indicate a construct is well-formed. Judgement $t \text{ ok}$ holds if type t is declared. Judgement $S \text{ ok}$ holds if method specification S is well formed: all formal parameters \overline{x} in it are distinct, and all the types \overline{t} , t in it are declared. Judgement $T \text{ ok}$ holds if type literal T is well formed: for a structure, all field names must be distinct and all types declared; for an interface, all its method specifications must be well formed. Judgement $D \text{ ok}$ holds if declaration D is well formed: for a type declaration, its type literal must be well formed; for a method declaration, its receiver and formal parameters must be distinct, all types must be declared, the method body must be well typed in the appropriate environment, and the expression type must implement the declared return type.

Judgement $\Gamma \vdash e : t$ holds if in environment Γ expression e has type t . Rules for variable, method call, structure literal, and field selection are straightforward. For instance, the four hypotheses for a method call check the type of the receiver, check the types of the arguments, look up the signature of the method, and confirm the types of the arguments implement the types of the parameters.

Type assertions are more interesting. A type assertion $e.(t)$ always returns a value of type t (if it doesn't panic). Let e have type u . There are three cases. If u and t are both interface types (T-ASSERT_I) then the assertion is always allowed, since e could always conceivably evaluate to a structure that implements t . If u is an interface but t is a structure (T-ASSERT_S) then the assertion is allowed only if t implements u , since otherwise e could not possibly contain a structure of type t . If u is a structure type (T-STUPID) then it is stupid to write the assertion in source code, since

Implements, well-formed type

$$\frac{<_S}{t_S <: t_S} \quad \frac{<_I \quad \text{methods}(t) \supseteq \text{methods}(t_I)}{t <: t_I} \quad \frac{\text{T-NAMED} \quad (\text{type } t \ T) \in \bar{D}}{t \text{ ok}} \quad \boxed{t <: u} \quad \boxed{t \text{ ok}}$$

Well-formed method specifications and type literals

$$\frac{\text{T-SPECIFICATION} \quad \text{distinct}(\bar{x}) \quad \overline{t \text{ ok}} \quad t \text{ ok}}{m(\bar{x} \ t) \ t \text{ ok}} \quad \frac{\text{T-STRUCT} \quad \text{distinct}(\bar{f}) \quad \overline{t \text{ ok}}}{\text{struct } \{\bar{f} \ t\} \text{ ok}} \quad \frac{\text{T-INTERFACE} \quad \text{unique}(\bar{S}) \quad \overline{S \text{ ok}}}{\text{interface } \{\bar{S}\} \text{ ok}} \quad \boxed{S \text{ ok}} \quad \boxed{T \text{ ok}}$$

Well-formed declarations

$$\frac{\text{T-TYPE} \quad T \text{ ok}}{\text{type } t \ T \text{ ok}} \quad \frac{\text{T-FUNC} \quad \text{distinct}(x, \bar{x}) \quad t_S \text{ ok} \quad \overline{t \text{ ok}} \quad u \text{ ok} \quad x : t_S, \bar{x} : t \vdash e : t \quad t <: u}{\text{func } (x \ t_S) \ m(\bar{x} \ t) \ u \ \{\text{return } e\} \text{ ok}} \quad \boxed{D \text{ ok}}$$

Expressions

$$\frac{\text{T-VAR} \quad (x : t) \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : t} \quad \frac{\text{T-CALL} \quad \Gamma \vdash e : t \quad \Gamma \vdash \bar{e} : t \quad (m(\bar{x} \ u) \ u) \in \text{methods}(t) \quad \overline{t <: u}}{\Gamma \vdash e.m(\bar{e}) : u} \quad \boxed{\Gamma \vdash e : t}$$

$$\frac{\text{T-LITERAL} \quad t_S \text{ ok} \quad \Gamma \vdash \bar{e} : t \quad (\bar{f} \ u) = \text{fields}(t_S) \quad \overline{t <: u}}{\Gamma \vdash t_S\{\bar{e}\} : t_S} \quad \frac{\text{T-FIELD} \quad \Gamma \vdash e : t_S \quad (\bar{f} \ u) = \text{fields}(t_S)}{\Gamma \vdash e.fi : u_i}$$

$$\frac{\text{T-ASSERT}_I \quad t_I \text{ ok} \quad \Gamma \vdash e : u_I}{\Gamma \vdash e.(t_I) : t_I} \quad \frac{\text{T-ASSERT}_S \quad t_S \text{ ok} \quad \Gamma \vdash e : u_I \quad t_S <: u_I}{\Gamma \vdash e.(t_S) : t_S} \quad \boxed{\text{T-STUPID} \quad \frac{t \text{ ok} \quad \Gamma \vdash e : u_S}{\Gamma \vdash e.(t) : t}}$$

Programs

$$\frac{\text{T-PROG} \quad \text{distinct}(t\text{decls}(\bar{D})) \quad \text{distinct}(m\text{decls}(\bar{D})) \quad \overline{D \text{ ok}} \quad \emptyset \vdash e : t}{\text{package main; } \bar{D} \ \text{func main}() \ \{_ = e\} \text{ ok}} \quad \boxed{P \text{ ok}}$$

Fig. 13. FG typing

the assertion could be checked at compile time, making it pointless. Nonetheless, during reduction a variable of interface type will be replaced by a value of structure type, so without such stupid type assertions an expression would become ill-typed during reduction. We write a box around this rule to indicate that it doesn't apply to source terms, but may apply to terms that result from reducing the source. Stupid type assertions are similar to stupid casts as found in Featherweight Java.

Judgement $P \text{ ok}$ holds if program P is well formed: all its type declarations are distinct, all its method declarations are distinct (each pair of a receiver type with a method name is distinct), all its declarations are well formed, and its body is well typed in the empty environment.

		Value	$v ::= t_S\{\bar{v}\}$
Evaluation context	$E ::=$		
Hole	\square	Structure	$t_S\{\bar{v}, E, \bar{e}\}$
Method call receiver	$E.m(\bar{e})$	Select	$E.f$
Method call arguments	$v.m(\bar{v}, E, \bar{e})$	Type assertion	$E.(t)$
Reduction			$d \longrightarrow e$
R-FIELD	$\frac{(f\ t) = \text{fields}(t_S)}{t_S\{\bar{v}\}.f_i \longrightarrow v_i}$	R-CALL	$\frac{(x : t_S, \bar{x} : \bar{t}).e = \text{body}(\text{type}(v).m)}{v.m(\bar{v}) \longrightarrow e[x := v, \bar{x} := \bar{v}]}$
		R-ASSERT	$\frac{\text{type}(v) <: t}{v.(t) \longrightarrow v}$
		R-CONTEXT	$\frac{d \longrightarrow e}{E[d] \longrightarrow E[e]}$

Fig. 14. FG reduction

3.4 FG Reduction

Figure 14 presents the FG reduction rules. A value v is a structure literal $t_S\{\bar{v}\}$ where each field is itself filled with a value. The auxiliary function $\text{type}(v)$ returns t_S when $v = t_S\{\bar{v}\}$. Evaluation contexts E are defined in the usual way. Judgement $d \longrightarrow e$ holds if expression d steps to expression e . There are four rules, for field selection, method call, type assertion, and closure under evaluation contexts. All are straightforward.

3.5 FG properties

We have the usual results relating typing and reduction.

LEMMA 3.1 (WELL FORMED). *If $\Gamma \vdash e : t$ then t ok.*

The substitution lemma is straightforward. It is sufficient to consider empty environments for the substituted terms, since FG has no binding constructs (such as lambda) in expressions.

LEMMA 3.2 (SUBSTITUTION). *If $\emptyset \vdash \bar{v} : \bar{t}$ and $\bar{x} : \bar{u} \vdash e : u$ and $\bar{t} <: \bar{u}$ then $\emptyset \vdash e[\bar{x} := \bar{v}] : t$ for some type t with $t <: u$.*

The following are straightforward adaptations of the usual results. We say expression e *panics* if there exist evaluation context E , value v , and type t such that $e = E[v.(t)]$ and $\text{type}(v) \not<: t$.

THEOREM 3.3 (PRESERVATION). *If $\emptyset \vdash d : u$ and $d \longrightarrow e$ then $\emptyset \vdash e : t$ for some t with $t <: u$.*

THEOREM 3.4 (PROGRESS). *If $\emptyset \vdash d : u$ then either d is a value, $d \longrightarrow e$ for some e , or d panics.*

4 FEATHERWEIGHT GENERIC GO

4.1 FGG Syntax

Figure 15 presents FGG syntax, with the differences from FG syntax highlighted. We let α range over type parameters and let τ, σ range over types. A type is either a type parameter α or a named type $t(\bar{\tau})$. We also let τ_S, σ_S range over structure types of the form $t_S(\bar{\tau})$; τ_I, σ_I range over interface types of the form $t_I(\bar{\tau})$; and, τ_J, σ_J range over types that are either type parameters or interfaces τ_I .

Expressions and declarations are updated to replace type names by types, and method calls are updated to include type parameters: a structure declaration is now **struct** $\{f\ \tau\}$ and a method call is now $e.m(\bar{\tau})(\bar{e})$, a structure literal is now $\tau_S\{\bar{e}\}$, and a type assertion is now $e.(\tau)$.

We let Φ, Ψ range over type formals, which have the form **type** $\bar{\alpha}\ \bar{\tau}_I$, pairing type parameters with their bounds, which are interface types. The bounds in type formals are mutually recursive,

Field name	f	Type	$\tau, \sigma ::=$
Method name	m	Type parameter	α
Variable name	x	Named type	$t(\bar{\tau})$
Structure type name	t_S, u_S	Structure type	$\tau_S, \sigma_S ::= t_S(\bar{\tau})$
Interface type name	t_I, u_I	Interface type	$\tau_I, \sigma_I ::= t_I(\bar{\tau})$
Type name	$t, u ::= t_S \mid t_I$	Interface-like type	$\tau_J, \sigma_J ::= \alpha \mid \tau_I$
Type parameter	α	Type formal	$\Phi, \Psi ::= \mathbf{type} \ \bar{\alpha} \ \bar{\tau}_I$
Method signature	$M ::= (\Psi)(\bar{x} \ \bar{\tau}) \ \tau$	Type actual	$\phi, \psi ::= \bar{\tau}$
Method specification	$S ::= mM$	Expression	$e ::=$
Type Literal	$T ::=$	Variable	x
Structure	$\mathbf{struct} \ \{\bar{f} \ \bar{\tau}\}$	Method call	$e.m(\bar{\tau})(\bar{e})$
Interface	$\mathbf{interface} \ \{\bar{S}\}$	Structure literal	$\tau_S\{\bar{e}\}$
Declaration	$D ::=$	Select	$e.f$
Type declaration	$\mathbf{type} \ t(\Phi) \ T$	Type assertion	$e.(\tau)$
Method declaration	$\mathbf{func} \ (x \ t_S(\Phi)) \ mM \ \{\mathbf{return} \ e\}$		
Program	$P ::= \mathbf{package} \ \mathbf{main}; \ \bar{D} \ \mathbf{func} \ \mathbf{main}() \ \{_ = e\}$		

Fig. 15. FGG syntax

i.e., each interface in $\bar{\tau}_I$ may refer to any parameter in $\bar{\alpha}$. Type declarations $\mathbf{type} \ t(\Phi) \ T$, and signatures $(\Psi)(\bar{x} \ \bar{\tau}) \ \tau$, and method declarations $\mathbf{func} \ (x \ t_S(\Phi)) \ mM \ \{\mathbf{return} \ e\}$ now include type formals.

We let ϕ, ψ range over type actuals, which are sequences of types.

4.2 Auxiliary functions

Figure 16 presents several auxiliary definitions. As before, Γ ranges over environments, which are now sequences that pair variables with types, $\bar{x} : \bar{\tau}$. In addition, Δ ranges over type environments, which are sequences that pair type parameters with bounds, $\bar{\alpha} : \bar{\tau}_I$. Type formals Φ, Ψ may implicitly coerce to type environments.

We write $\eta = (\Phi := \phi)$ for the substitution of formals Φ by actuals ϕ , and $\eta = (\Phi :=_{\Delta} \phi)$ for the partial function that also checks that ϕ respects the bounds imposed by Φ . If a partial function that is undefined appears in the hypothesis of a rule, then the corresponding premise does not hold. We write $\hat{\Phi}$ for the type parameters of Φ .

Functions $fields(\tau_S)$ and $body(\tau_S.m(\psi))$ are updated to replace type names by types, and for the latter to include method type arguments. The definitions are adjusted to include type formals which are instantiated appropriately. Functions $type$, $tdecls$, and $mdecls$ and predicate $unique$ are updated to replace type names by types and to include type formals. Function $bounds_{\Delta}(\tau)$ takes a type parameter to its bound, and leaves its argument unchanged otherwise.

Function $methods_{\Delta}(\tau)$ is updated to accept a type environment and to replace type names by types. The definition is adjusted to include type formals which are instantiated appropriately. If $methods$ is applied to a type parameter, that parameter behaves the same as its bounding interface, so $methods_{\Delta}(\tau) = methods_{\Delta}(bounds_{\Delta}(\tau))$ for all τ .

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{(\mathbf{type} \ \overline{\alpha \ \tau_I}) = \Phi \quad \eta = (\overline{\alpha := \tau})}{(\Phi := \overline{\tau}) = \eta} \quad \frac{(\mathbf{type} \ \overline{\alpha \ \tau_I}) = \Phi \quad \eta = (\Phi := \phi) \quad \Delta \vdash (\overline{\alpha <: \tau_I})[\eta]}{(\Phi :=_{\Delta} \phi) = \eta} \\
\\
\frac{(\mathbf{type} \ t_S(\Phi) \ \mathbf{struct} \ \{\overline{f \ \tau}\}) \in \overline{D} \quad \eta = (\Phi := \phi)}{fields(t_S(\phi)) = (\overline{f \ \tau})[\eta]} \\
\\
\frac{(\mathbf{func} \ (x \ t_S(\Phi)) \ m(\Psi)(\overline{x \ \tau}) \ \tau \ \{\mathbf{return} \ e\}) \in \overline{D} \quad \theta = (\Phi, \Psi := \phi, \psi)}{body(t_S(\phi).m(\psi)) = (x : t_S(\phi), \overline{x : \tau}).e[\theta]} \\
\\
\frac{(\mathbf{type} \ \overline{\alpha \ \tau_I}) = \Phi}{\hat{\Phi} = \overline{\alpha}} \quad type(\tau_S\{\overline{v}\}) = \tau_S \quad \frac{mM_1, mM_2 \in \overline{S} \text{ implies } M_1 = M_2}{unique(\overline{S})} \\
\\
tdecls(\overline{D}) = [t \mid (\mathbf{type} \ t(\Phi) \ T) \in \overline{D}] \\
\\
mdecls(\overline{D}) = [t_S.m \mid (\mathbf{func} \ (x \ t_S(\Phi)) \ mM \ \{\mathbf{return} \ e\}) \in \overline{D}] \\
\\
\frac{(\alpha : \tau_I) \in \Delta}{bounds_{\Delta}(\alpha) = \tau_I} \quad bounds_{\Delta}(\tau_S) = \tau_S \quad bounds_{\Delta}(\tau_I) = \tau_I \\
\\
methods_{\Delta}(t_S(\phi)) = \{(mM)[\eta] \mid (\mathbf{func} \ (x \ t_S(\Phi)) \ mM \ \{\mathbf{return} \ e\}) \in \overline{D}, \eta = (\Phi :=_{\Delta} \phi)\} \\
\\
\frac{\mathbf{type} \ t_I(\Phi) \ \mathbf{interface} \ \{\overline{S}\} \in \overline{D} \quad \eta = (\Phi := \phi)}{methods_{\Delta}(t_I(\phi)) = \overline{S}[\eta]} \quad \frac{(\alpha : \tau_I) \in \Delta}{methods_{\Delta}(\alpha) = methods_{\Delta}(\tau_I)}
\end{array}$$

Fig. 16. FGG auxiliary functions

4.3 FGG Typing

Figure 17 presents the FGG typing rules. Judgement $\Delta \vdash \tau <: \sigma$ now depends on a type environment and relates types rather than type names. The definition is adjusted so that a type parameter implements its bound. It still follows from the definition that $<:$ is reflexive and transitive. Judgement $\Phi <: \Psi$ compares the corresponding bounds of two type formals under an empty type environment.

Judgement $\Delta \vdash \tau \text{ ok}$ holds if a type is well formed: all type parameters in it must be declared in Δ and all named types must be instantiated with type arguments that satisfy the bounds of the corresponding type parameters. Judgement $\Delta \vdash \phi \text{ ok}$ holds if under environment Δ all types in ϕ are well formed.

Judgement $\Phi \vdash \Psi \text{ ok}$ holds if under type environment Φ the type formal Ψ is well formed: all type parameters bound by Φ and Ψ are distinct, and all the bounds in Ψ are well formed in the type environment that results from combining Φ and Ψ . Note this permits mutually recursive bounds in a type formal. Judgement $\Phi; \Psi \text{ ok } \Delta$ holds if a method declaration with receiver formals Φ and method formals Ψ is well formed, yielding type environment Δ : it requires that Φ is well formed under the empty environment, Ψ is well formed under Φ , and Δ is the concatenation of Φ and Ψ . Hence, the type formals of the receiver are in scope when declaring the type formals of the method, but not vice versa, and both are in scope for declaring the types of the arguments and result.

Implements				$\boxed{\Delta \vdash \tau <: \sigma}$	$\boxed{\Phi <: \Psi}$
<-:PARAM	<-:S	<-:I	<-:FORMALS		
$\frac{}{\Delta \vdash \alpha <: \alpha}$	$\frac{}{\Delta \vdash \tau_S <: \tau_S}$	$\frac{\text{methods}_\Delta(\tau) \supseteq \text{methods}_\Delta(\tau_I)}{\Delta \vdash \tau <: \tau_I}$	$\frac{}{\emptyset \vdash \tau_I <: \sigma_I}$		
			$(\text{type } \overline{\alpha} \tau_I) <: (\text{type } \overline{\alpha} \sigma_I)$		
Well-formed type and actuals				$\boxed{\Delta \vdash \tau \text{ ok}}$	$\boxed{\Delta \vdash \phi \text{ ok}}$
T-PARAM	T-NAMED		T-ACTUAL		
$\frac{(\alpha : \tau_I) \in \Delta}{\Delta \vdash \alpha \text{ ok}}$	$\frac{\Delta \vdash \phi \text{ ok} \quad (\text{type } t(\Phi) T) \in \overline{D} \quad \eta = (\Phi :=_\Delta \phi)}{\Delta \vdash t(\phi) \text{ ok}}$		$\frac{\overline{\tau} = \phi \quad \Delta \vdash \overline{\tau} \text{ ok}}{\Delta \vdash \phi \text{ ok}}$		
Well-formed type formals and nested formals				$\boxed{\Phi \vdash \Psi \text{ ok}}$	$\boxed{\Phi; \Psi \text{ ok } \Delta}$
T-FORMAL		T-NESTED			
$\frac{(\text{type } \overline{\alpha} \tau_I) = \Psi \quad \text{distinct}(\hat{\Phi}, \overline{\alpha}) \quad \Phi, \Psi \vdash \tau_I \text{ ok}}{\Phi \vdash \Psi \text{ ok}}$		$\frac{\emptyset \vdash \Phi \text{ ok} \quad \Phi \vdash \Psi \text{ ok} \quad \Delta = \Phi, \Psi}{\Phi; \Psi \text{ ok } \Delta}$			
Well-formed method specifications and type literals				$\boxed{\Phi \vdash S \text{ ok}}$	$\boxed{\Phi \vdash T \text{ ok}}$
T-SPECIFICATION		T-STRUCT	T-INTERFACE		
$\frac{\Phi; \Psi \text{ ok } \Delta \quad \text{distinct}(\overline{x}) \quad \Delta \vdash \overline{\tau} \text{ ok} \quad \Delta \vdash \tau \text{ ok}}{\Phi \vdash m(\Psi)(\overline{x} \overline{\tau}) \tau \text{ ok}}$		$\frac{\text{distinct}(\overline{f}) \quad \Phi \vdash \overline{\tau} \text{ ok}}{\Phi \vdash \text{struct } \{\overline{f} \overline{\tau}\} \text{ ok}}$	$\frac{\text{unique}(\overline{S}) \quad \Phi \vdash \overline{S} \text{ ok}}{\Phi \vdash \text{interface } \{\overline{S}\}}$		
Well-formed declarations					$\boxed{D \text{ ok}}$
T-TYPE	T-FUNC				
$\frac{\emptyset \vdash \Phi \text{ ok} \quad \Phi \vdash T \text{ ok}}{\text{type } t(\Phi) T \text{ ok}}$	$\frac{\text{distinct}(x, \overline{x}) \quad (\text{type } t_S(\Phi') T) \in \overline{D} \quad \Phi <: \Phi' \quad \Phi; \Psi \text{ ok } \Delta \quad \Delta \vdash \overline{\tau} \text{ ok} \quad \Delta \vdash \sigma \text{ ok} \quad \Delta; x : t_S(\hat{\Phi}), \overline{x} : \overline{\tau} \vdash e : \tau}{\text{func } (x t_S(\Phi)) m(\Psi)(\overline{x} \overline{\tau}) \sigma \{\text{return } e\} \text{ ok}}$				
Expressions					$\boxed{\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau <}$
T-VAR	T-CALL				
$\frac{(x : \tau) \in \Gamma}{\Delta; \Gamma \vdash x : \tau}$	$\frac{(m(\Psi)(\overline{x} \overline{\sigma}) \sigma) \in \text{methods}_\Delta(\tau) \quad \Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \quad \Delta; \Gamma \vdash \overline{e} : \overline{\tau} \quad \eta = (\Psi :=_\Delta \psi) \quad \Delta \vdash (\overline{\tau} <: \overline{\sigma})[\eta]}{\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e.m(\psi)(\overline{e}) : \sigma[\eta]}$				
T-LITERAL		T-FIELD			
$\frac{\Delta \vdash \tau_S \text{ ok} \quad \Delta; \Gamma \vdash \overline{e} : \overline{\tau} \quad (\overline{f} \overline{\sigma}) = \text{fields}(\tau_S) \quad \Delta \vdash \overline{\tau} <: \sigma}{\Delta; \Gamma \vdash \tau_S \{\overline{e}\} : \tau_S}$		$\frac{\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau_S \quad (\overline{f} \overline{\tau}) = \text{fields}(\tau_S)}{\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e.f_i : \tau_i}$			
T-ASSERT_I	T-ASSERT_S		T-STUPID		
$\frac{\Delta \vdash \tau_J \text{ ok} \quad \Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \sigma_J}{\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e.(\tau_J) : \tau_J}$	$\frac{\Delta \vdash \tau_S \text{ ok} \quad \Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \sigma_J \quad \tau_S <: \text{bounds}_\Delta(\sigma_J)}{\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e.(\tau_S) : \tau_S}$		$\frac{\Delta \vdash \tau \text{ ok} \quad \Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \sigma_S}{\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e.(\tau) : \tau}$		
Programs					$\boxed{P \text{ ok}}$
T-PROG					
$\frac{\text{distinct}(tdecls(\overline{D})) \quad \text{distinct}(mdecls(\overline{D})) \quad \overline{D} \text{ ok} \quad \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e : \tau}{\text{package main; } \overline{D} \text{ func main() } \{ _ = e \} \text{ ok}}$					

Fig. 17. FGG typing

		Value	$v ::= \tau_S\{\bar{v}\}$
Evaluation context	$E ::=$		
Hole	\square	Structure	$\tau_S\{\bar{v}, E, \bar{e}\}$
Method call receiver	$E.m(\bar{\tau})(\bar{e})$	Select	$E.f$
Method call arguments	$v.m(\bar{\tau})(\bar{v}, E, \bar{e})$	Type assertion	$E.(\tau)$
Reduction			
$d \longrightarrow e$			
$\frac{\text{R-FIELD}}{(f \ \tau) = \text{fields}(\tau_S)} \quad \tau_S\{\bar{v}\}.f_i \longrightarrow v_i$	$\frac{\text{R-CALL}}{(x : \tau_S, \bar{x} : \bar{\tau}).e = \text{body}(\text{type}(v).m(\psi))} \quad v.m(\psi)(\bar{v}) \longrightarrow e[x := v, \bar{x} := \bar{v}]$	$\frac{\text{R-ASSERT}}{\emptyset \vdash \text{type}(v) <: \tau} \quad v.(\tau) \longrightarrow v$	$\frac{\text{R-CONTEXT}}{d \longrightarrow e} \quad E[d] \longrightarrow E[e]$

Fig. 18. FGG reduction

Judgement $\Phi \vdash S \text{ ok}$ holds if under type environment Φ method specification S is well formed: it requires $\Phi, \Psi \text{ ok } \Delta$ where Ψ is the type formals of the method specification, and the rest is similar to before but now under type environment Δ . Judgement $\Phi \vdash T \text{ ok}$ holds if under type formals Φ type literal T is well formed, and again is a straightforward adjustment of its earlier definition.

Judgement $D \text{ ok}$ holds if declaration D is well formed. The definitions are similar to previous definition. For a type declaration, its type formals must be well formed under the empty type environment, and its type literal must be well formed under the environment given by the type formals. For a method declaration, we require $\Phi; \Psi \text{ ok } \Delta$, where Φ are the type formals of the receiver and Ψ are the type formals of the method. The receiver type must be declared with formals Φ' , where $\Phi <: \Phi'$. An alternative, simpler design would require Φ and Φ' to be identical; but that would rule out the solution to the expression problem given in Section 2.3. The rest is a straightforward adjustment of its earlier definition.

Judgement $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau$ holds if under type environment Δ and environment Γ expression e has type τ . The adjustments are straightforward. Method calls are adjusted so that the type of the arguments and result are instantiated by the method type arguments. Type assertions are adjusted to take into account that type names are replaced by types. In method calls and type assertions, type parameters are treated as equivalent to the parameters' bound.

4.4 FGG Reduction

Figure 18 presents the FGG reduction rules.

The adjustment to values, the auxiliary function *type*, and to evaluation contexts are simple, replacing type names by types and adding type arguments as appropriate. Judgement $d \longrightarrow e$ holds if expression d steps to expression e . Again, the adjustments are all simple.

4.5 FGG properties

The results of the previous section adapt straightforwardly.

LEMMA 4.1 (WELL FORMED). *If $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau$ then $\Delta \vdash \tau \text{ ok}$.*

The substitution lemma is adapted to take into account that in a method declaration the type parameters of the receiver are substituted before the type parameters of the method.

LEMMA 4.2 (SUBSTITUTION). *Let $\eta = (\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau})$ be a substitution.*

- *If $\emptyset \vdash \bar{\alpha} <: \bar{\tau}_T[\eta]$ and $\bar{\alpha} : \bar{\tau}_T$, $\Delta \vdash \tau \text{ ok}$ then $\Delta[\eta] \vdash \tau[\eta] \text{ ok}$.*
- *If $\emptyset \vdash \bar{\alpha} <: \bar{\tau}_T[\eta]$ and $\bar{\alpha} : \bar{\tau}_T$, $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau$ then $\Delta[\eta]; \Gamma[\eta] \vdash e[\eta] : \tau[\eta]$.*

<pre> type Any interface {} type Int struct {} type Event interface { Process(type b Any)(y b) Int } type UIEvent struct {} func (x UIEvent) Process(type b Any)(y b) Int { return Int{} } type Dispatcher struct {} func (x Dispatcher) Dispatch(y Event) Int { return y.Process(Int)(Int{}) } func main() { _ = Dispatcher{}.Dispatch(UIEvent{}) } </pre>	<pre> type Top struct {} type Int struct {} type Event interface { Process<Int>(y Int) Int Process<1>() Top } type UIEvent struct {} func (x UIEvent) Process<Int>(y Int) Int { return Int{} } func (x UIEvent) Process<1>() Top { return Top{} } type Dispatcher struct {} func (x Dispatcher) Dispatch(y Event) Int { return y.Process<Int>(Int{}) } func (x Dispatcher) Dispatch<1>() Top { return Top{} } func main() { _ = Dispatcher{}.Dispatch(UIEvent{}) } </pre>
---	--

Fig. 19. Dispatcher example: FGG source (left) and FG translation (right)

- If $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \overline{v} : \tau$ and $\emptyset; \overline{x} : \sigma \vdash e : \sigma$ and $\emptyset \vdash \overline{\tau} <: \sigma$ then $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e[\overline{x} := \overline{v}] : \tau$ for some type τ with $\emptyset \vdash \tau <: \sigma$.

The remaining results are easy to adjust.

THEOREM 4.3 (PRESERVATION). *If $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash d : \sigma$ and $d \longrightarrow e$ then $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e : \tau$ for some τ with $\emptyset \vdash \tau <: \sigma$.*

Expression d *panics* if there exist evaluation context E , value v , and type τ such that $d = E[v.(\tau)]$ and $\emptyset \vdash \text{type}(v) \not\prec: \tau$.

THEOREM 4.4 (PROGRESS). *If $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash d : \sigma$ then either d is a value, $d \longrightarrow e$ for some e , or d panics.*

5 MONOMORPHISATION

The monomorphisation process consists of two phases. In the first phase, a set of types and method instantiations are collected from an FGG program. In the second phase, an FGG program is translated to its FG equivalent following the instance set computed in the first phase.

Throughout this section, we illustrate the monomorphisation process with the FGG program in Figure 19 (left). This program contains a `Dispatcher` structure which processes abstract `Events`. A `Dispatcher` processes events, and events are objects that can be processed. For the sake of space, the program in Figure 19 includes only one implementation of `Events`, i.e., `UIEvents`, but other implementations may be easily added following the same pattern.

5.1 Collecting type and method instances

Let ω, Ω range over instance sets, which contain elements of type τ or pairs of a type with a method and its type arguments, $\tau.m(\psi)$. In Figure 20 we define a judgement $P \blacktriangleright \Omega$ which computes the set of instances of types and methods required to correctly monomorphise an FGG program.

Judgement $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e \blacktriangleright \omega$ holds if ω is the instance set for expression e , given environments Δ and Γ . In the rules for variables, structure literals, field selections and type assertions, we simply collect

Instance sets

 ω, Ω ω, Ω range over sets containing elements of the form τ or $\tau.m(\psi)$.

Expressions and programs

 $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e \blacktriangleright \omega$ $P \blacktriangleright \Omega$

I-VAR

 $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash x \blacktriangleright \emptyset$

I-LITERAL

 $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash \overline{e} \blacktriangleright \overline{\omega}$
 $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash \tau_S\{\overline{e}\} \blacktriangleright \{\tau_S\} \cup \overline{\omega}$

I-FIELD

 $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e \blacktriangleright \omega$
 $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e.f_i \blacktriangleright \omega$

I-ASSERT

 $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e \blacktriangleright \omega$
 $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e.(\tau) \blacktriangleright \{\tau\} \cup \omega$

I-CALL

 $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau \quad \Delta; \Gamma \vdash e \blacktriangleright \omega \quad \Delta; \Gamma \vdash \overline{e} \blacktriangleright \overline{\omega}$
 $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e.m(\psi)(\overline{e}) \blacktriangleright \{\tau, \tau.m(\psi)\} \cup \omega \cup \overline{\omega}$

I-PROG

 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e \blacktriangleright \omega \quad \Omega = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_\emptyset^n(\omega)$
package main; \overline{D} func main() { $_ = e$ } $\blacktriangleright \Omega$

Auxiliary functions

$$G_\Delta(\omega) = \omega \cup F\text{-closure}(\omega) \cup M\text{-closure}_\Delta(\omega) \cup I\text{-closure}_\Delta(\omega) \cup S\text{-closure}_\Delta(\omega)$$

$$F\text{-closure}(\omega) = \bigcup \left\{ \overline{\tau} \mid \tau_S \in \omega, (\overline{f} \overline{\tau}) = \text{fields}(\tau_S) \right\}$$

$$M\text{-closure}_\Delta(\omega) = \bigcup \left\{ \overline{\sigma}[\eta] \cup \{\sigma[\eta]\} \mid \tau.m(\psi) \in \omega, (m(\Psi)(\overline{x} \overline{\sigma}) \sigma) \in \text{methods}_\Delta(\tau), \eta = (\Psi := \psi) \right\}$$

$$I\text{-closure}_\Delta(\omega) = \left\{ \tau'_I.m(\psi) \mid \tau_I.m(\psi) \in \omega, \tau'_I \in \omega, \Delta \vdash \tau'_I <: \tau_I \right\}$$

$$S\text{-closure}_\Delta(\omega) = \bigcup \left\{ \{\tau_S.m(\psi)\} \cup \Omega \mid \begin{array}{l} \tau.m(\psi) \in \omega, \tau_S \in \omega, \Delta \vdash \tau_S <: \tau, \Delta; x : \tau_S, \overline{x} : \overline{\sigma} \vdash e \blacktriangleright \Omega \\ (x : \tau_S, \overline{x} : \overline{\sigma}).e = \text{body}(\tau_S.m(\psi)) \end{array} \right\}$$

Fig. 20. Computing instance sets

the occurrences of type instances and proceed inductively. The rule for method calls additionally records the instantiation of the method $\tau.m(\psi)$ where τ is the type of its receiver. In the rules for structure literals and method calls, we assume that sequences of instance sets, e.g., $\overline{\omega}$, coerce to a set consisting of the union of the elements of the sequence.

The instance set of a program P is the limit of function G applied to the instance set of its body. $G_\Delta(\omega)$ is defined via four auxiliary functions that compute the type and method instances required by ω . It returns all type and method instantiations that are required to monomorphise declarations ($F\text{-closure}$, $M\text{-closure}$) and to preserve the $<:$ relation ($I\text{-closure}$, $S\text{-closure}$).

$F\text{-closure}$ finds all the type instances that occur in the declarations of structures, while $M\text{-closure}$ finds all the type instances that occur in the declarations of method instances.

$I\text{-closure}$ finds all the method signature instances that are required to preserve the $<:$ relation over interfaces. $S\text{-closure}$ finds all the type and method sets required by method calls, inter-procedurally. For each method instance $\tau.m(\psi)$ in ω it finds all instance sets of all implementations of method m , following the $<:$ relation. Intuitively, $I\text{-closure}$ and $S\text{-closure}$ are used to guarantee that if $\tau <: \sigma$, then the monomorphised version of τ also implements the monomorphised version of σ .

Consider the example in Figure 19 (left). For the top-level method, we have

$$\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \text{Dispatcher}\{\}. \text{Dispatch}(\text{UIEvent}\{\}) \blacktriangleright \{\text{Dispatcher}, \text{Dispatcher.Dispatch}()\}$$

Types and methods	$\boxed{\eta \vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger}$	$\boxed{\eta \vdash t(\Phi) \mapsto t^\dagger}$	$\boxed{\eta \vdash m(\psi) \mapsto m^\dagger}$	$\boxed{\eta \vdash m(\Psi) \mapsto m^\dagger}$			
M-TYPE	$\frac{t^\dagger = \langle \tau[\eta] \rangle}{\eta \vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger}$	M-TFORMAL	$\frac{t^\dagger = \langle t(\overline{\alpha}[\eta]) \rangle}{\eta \vdash t(\mathbf{type} \overline{\alpha} \overline{\tau}_I) \mapsto t^\dagger}$	M-METHOD	$\frac{m^\dagger = \langle m(\psi[\eta]) \rangle}{\eta \vdash m(\psi) \mapsto m^\dagger}$	M-MFORMAL	$\frac{m^\dagger = \langle m(\overline{\alpha}[\eta]) \rangle}{\eta \vdash m(\mathbf{type} \overline{\alpha} \overline{\tau}_I) \mapsto m^\dagger}$
Expression	M-VAR	M-VALUE	M-SELECT	$\boxed{\eta \vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger}$			
	$\frac{}{\eta \vdash x \mapsto x}$	$\frac{\eta \vdash \tau_S \mapsto t_S^\dagger \quad \eta \vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger}{\eta \vdash \tau_S \{ \overline{e} \} \mapsto t_S^\dagger \{ \overline{e^\dagger} \}}$	$\frac{}{\eta \vdash e.f \mapsto e^\dagger.f}$				
	M-CALL	M-ASSERT					
	$\frac{\eta \vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger \quad \eta \vdash m(\psi) \mapsto m^\dagger \quad \eta \vdash \overline{e} \mapsto \overline{e^\dagger}}{\eta \vdash e.m(\psi)(\overline{e}) \mapsto e^\dagger.m^\dagger(\overline{e^\dagger})}$	$\frac{\eta \vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger \quad \eta \vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger}{\eta \vdash e.(\tau) \mapsto e^\dagger.(t^\dagger)}$					
Method signature	M-SIG	M-ID	$\boxed{\eta \vdash M \mapsto M^\dagger}$	$\boxed{\eta \vdash S \mapsto S^\dagger}$			
	$\frac{\eta \vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger \quad \eta \vdash \tau \mapsto u^\dagger}{\eta \vdash (\overline{x} \overline{\tau}) \tau \mapsto (\overline{x} t^\dagger) u^\dagger}$	$\frac{hash(mM[\eta]) = m^*}{\eta \vdash mM \mapsto m^*(\text{Top})}$					
Type literal	M-STRUCT	M-INTERFACE		$\boxed{\eta; \mu \vdash T \mapsto T^\dagger}$			
	$\frac{}{\eta; \mu \vdash \mathbf{struct} \{ \overline{f} \overline{\tau} \} \mapsto \mathbf{struct} \{ \overline{f} t^\dagger \}}$	$\frac{}{\eta; \mu \vdash \mathbf{interface} \{ \overline{S} \} \mapsto \mathbf{interface} \{ \bigcup \overline{S} \}}$					

Fig. 21. Monomorphisation of FGG into FG — name mapping

Posing $\omega_0 = \{\text{Dispatcher}, \text{Dispatcher.Dispatch}()\}$, we compute the limit of G applied to ω_0 . We have $G_\emptyset(\omega_0) = \omega_0 \cup \{\text{Event}, \text{Int}, \text{Dispatcher.Dispatch}(), \text{Event}, \text{Event.Process}(\text{Int})\}$ where Event and Int are obtained from $M\text{-closure}_\emptyset(\omega_0)$, while $\text{Dispatcher.Dispatch}()$, Event , and $\text{Event.Process}(\text{Int})$ are obtained from $S\text{-closure}_\emptyset(\omega_0)$.

The limit of function G is reached after two iterations, i.e., $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_\emptyset^n(\omega_0) = G_\emptyset(G_\emptyset(\omega_0)) = G_\emptyset(\omega_0) \cup \{\text{UIEvent.Process}(\text{Int})\}$. Note that $\text{UIEvent.Process}(\text{Int})$ is obtained via $S\text{-closure}$ using the fact that $\text{UIEvent} <: \text{Event}$ holds.

5.2 Monomorphisation judgement

We now define a judgement $\vdash P \mapsto P^\dagger$ where P is a program in FGG, and P^\dagger is a corresponding monomorphised program in FG. This judgement is in turn defined by judgements for each of the syntactic categories in FGG. Some of the judgements are also parameterised by instance sets (ranged over by Ω), substitutions that map type parameters to ground types (ranged over by η), or method instance sets (ranged over by μ).

Figure 21 formalises how we recursively apply a consistent renaming to generate FG code. To monomorphise types, type formals, method names, and method formals, given a substitution η , we assume a map from closed types to identifiers. For instance, if f is a type with two arguments, and g and h are types with no arguments, then closed type $f(g(), h())$ might correspond to the identifier “ $f\langle g\langle \rangle, h\langle \rangle \rangle$ ” assuming “ \langle, \rangle ” are allowed as letters in identifiers. We write $t^\dagger = \langle \tau \rangle$ to

Interface specification

$$\boxed{\eta; \mu \vdash S \mapsto S}$$

M-SPEC

$$\frac{S = \left\{ m^\dagger N^\dagger \mid m(\psi) \in \mu, \theta = (\eta, \Psi := \psi), \theta \vdash m(\Psi) \mapsto m^\dagger, \theta \vdash N \mapsto N^\dagger \right\} \quad \eta \vdash m(\Psi)N \mapsto S^\dagger}{\eta; \mu \vdash m(\Psi)N \mapsto S \cup \{S^\dagger\}}$$

Declaration

$$\boxed{\Omega \vdash D \mapsto D}$$

M-TYPE

$$\frac{\mathcal{D} = \left\{ \mathbf{type} \, t^\dagger T^\dagger \mid t(\phi) \in \Omega, \eta = (\Phi := \phi), \mu = \{m(\psi) \mid t(\phi).m(\psi) \in \Omega\}, \eta; \mu \vdash T \mapsto T^\dagger \right\}}{\Omega \vdash \mathbf{type} \, t(\Phi) T \mapsto \mathcal{D}}$$

M-FUNC

$$\frac{\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} &= \left\{ \mathbf{func} \, (x \, t_S^\dagger) m^\dagger N^\dagger \{\mathbf{return} \, e^\dagger\} \mid \begin{array}{l} t_S(\phi).m(\psi) \in \Omega, \theta = (\Phi := \phi, \Psi := \psi), \theta \vdash t_S(\Phi) \mapsto t_S^\dagger \\ \theta \vdash m(\Psi) \mapsto m^\dagger, \theta \vdash N \mapsto N^\dagger, \theta \vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger \end{array} \right\} \\ \mathcal{D}' &= \left\{ \mathbf{func} \, (x \, t_S^\dagger) S^\dagger \{\mathbf{return} \, \text{Top}\{\}\} \mid t_S(\phi) \in \Omega, \eta = (\Phi := \phi), \eta \vdash t_S(\Phi) \mapsto t_S^\dagger, \eta \vdash m(\Psi)N \mapsto S^\dagger \right\} \end{aligned}}{\Omega \vdash \mathbf{func} \, (x \, t_S(\Phi)) m(\Psi)N \{\mathbf{return} \, e\} \mapsto \mathcal{D} \cup \mathcal{D}'}$$

Program

$$\boxed{\vdash P \mapsto P^\dagger}$$

M-PROGRAM

$$\frac{\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{package} \, \mathbf{main}; \overline{D} \, \mathbf{func} \, \mathbf{main}() \{ _ = e \} \blacktriangleright \Omega \\ \Omega \vdash \overline{D} \mapsto \overline{\mathcal{D}} \quad \overline{D}^\dagger &= \{ \mathbf{type} \, \text{Top} \, \mathbf{struct} \, \{\} \} \cup \bigcup \overline{\mathcal{D}} \quad \emptyset \vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger \end{aligned}}{\vdash \mathbf{package} \, \mathbf{main}; \overline{D} \, \mathbf{func} \, \mathbf{main}() \{ _ = e \} \mapsto \mathbf{package} \, \mathbf{main}; \overline{\overline{D}^\dagger} \, \mathbf{func} \, \mathbf{main}() \{ _ = e \}^\dagger}$$

Fig. 22. Monomorphisation of FGG into FG – instance generation, where N ranges over $(\overline{x} \, \tau) \, \tau$

compute the identifier t^\dagger that corresponds to closed type τ . Similarly, we write $m^\dagger = \langle m(\psi) \rangle$ to compute the identifier m^\dagger that corresponds to closed method instantiation $m(\psi)$.

To monomorphise an expression given a substitution η , we recursively monomorphise all the types and expressions contained within this expression. We proceed similarly to monomorphise method signatures in Rule M-SIG.

Rule M-ID is used to generate a dummy method signature that represents uniquely the alpha-equivalence class of its FGG counterpart. The signature specifies no parameters and the return type Top. It is necessary to generate such methods to ensure that if a type does not implement another in an FGG program, then this is also the case in its monomorphised counterpart. We assume that $\text{hash}(mM_1) = \text{hash}(mM_2)$ for all $M_1 = M_2$, using the same notion of equality as in *unique* and $<:$.

To monomorphise a structure given a substitution, we recursively monomorphise all the types contained within its field declarations. To monomorphise an interface, we recursively monomorphise each of its signatures and flatten the result in a single sequence of declarations.

Figure 22 formalises how declarations are generated from Ω . Here we let N range over $(\overline{x} \, \tau) \, \tau$.

To monomorphise an interface specification we pass *two* environments. One is a substitution from type parameters to ground types η and the other is a set of method instances μ , i.e., a set of entries of type $m(\psi)$. For each entry in μ , we compute a new substitution θ which extends η and is used to generate a monomorphised instance of the corresponding signature. In addition, we generate dummy signature S^\dagger that uniquely identifies the FGG signature. Each parameterised method may produce zero or more monomorphised instances, plus a dummy method signature.

To monomorphise the declaration of a type t given an instance set, for each instance of t , we generate a substitution η and a method instance set μ . Then we recursively produce a monomorphised declaration for each generated pair of η and μ . Note that each type declaration may produce zero or more monomorphised declarations.

To monomorphise a method declaration given an instance set, we compute a substitution θ for each method instance in Ω . Then we produce a monomorphised version of a method for each of its instantiations. Note that each method declaration may produce zero or more monomorphised declarations. In addition, for each type instance and each of its methods, we generate a dummy method that returns an instance of Top .

To monomorphise a program P , we compute its instance set Ω then monomorphise its declaration and body given with respect to Ω . We additionally add the declaration of the empty structure Top .

The FGG program in Figure 19 (left) is translated to the FG program on the righthand side of the figure. The translation starts with rule M-PROGRAM where $\Omega = \{\text{Int}, \text{Event}, \text{Event.Process}(\text{Int}), \text{UIEvent}, \text{UIEvent.Process}(\text{Int}), \text{Dispatcher}, \text{Dispatcher.Dispatch}()\}$. Rule M-TYPE is used to generate the instances of types Int , Event , UIEvent , and Dispatcher . Rule M-FUNC is used to generate the methods $\text{UIEvent.Process}(\text{Int})$ and $\text{Dispatcher.Dispatch}()$, as well as their dummy counterparts $\text{Process}(\text{Int})()$ and $\text{Dispatch}(\text{Int})()$. Rule M-SPEC is used to generate the method signatures of interface Event , i.e., $\text{Event.Process}(\text{Int})$ and its dummy counterpart $\text{Process}(\text{Int})()$.

5.3 Ruling out non-monomorphisable programs

It is not possible to monomorphise all FGG programs since programs that contain polymorphic recursive methods may produce infinitely many type instances. To address this issue, we propose a predicate $P \text{ nomono}$ which conservatively identifies programs that can produce infinitely many type instances. Programs for which this predicate does *not* hold are guaranteed to be monomorphisable. Note that there exist programs which produce finitely many type instances but for which the predicate does hold, e.g., programs containing a polymorphic recursive method that is never called.

The predicate is formally defined in Figure 23, notably reusing our instance generation procedures. $P \text{ nomono}$ holds if $D \text{ nomono}$ holds for at least one of its method declarations. $D \text{ nomono}$ holds if it is possible to find an element in its instance set, inductively constructed using function $S\text{-closure}$, such that the occurs check is satisfied. The occurs check holds when a type variable appears under a type constructor in a type instance or method call (in the same position it occupies in the type or method formal). We write $\text{fv}(\tau)$ for the set of type parameters occurring in τ .

5.4 Monomorphisation properties

Not all programs are monomorphisable, however we can decide whether a program is monomorphisable with the $P \text{ nomono}$ predicate.

THEOREM 5.1 (DECIDABILITY). *If P ok then it is decidable whether or not $P \text{ nomono}$ holds.*

For all well-typed programs P such that $P \text{ nomono}$ does not hold, their instance sets are finite.

THEOREM 5.2 (MONOMORPHISABLE). *If P ok and $P \text{ nomono}$ doesn't hold then $P \blacktriangleright \Omega$ with Ω finite.*

Monomorphisation preserves typing, i.e., the translation of a well-typed FGG program is a well-typed FG program.

THEOREM 5.3 (SOUND). *If P ok and $\vdash P \mapsto P^\dagger$ then P^\dagger ok.*

The reduction behaviour of well-typed FGG programs is preserved and reflected by their monomorphised counterpart (see Figure 24). Write $\vdash d \mapsto d^\dagger$ to abbreviate $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash d \mapsto d^\dagger$.

Not monomorphisable		$P \text{ nomono}$	$D \text{ nomono}$
MN-PROGRAM			
		$D_i \text{ nomono}$	
package main; \overline{D} func main() {$_ = e$} <i>nomono</i>			
MN-FUNC			
$\Delta = \Phi, \Psi$	exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(t_S(\phi).m(\psi)) \in G_{\Delta}^n(\{t_S(\hat{\Phi}), t_S(\hat{\Phi}).m(\hat{\Psi})\})$ s.t. $\Phi < \phi$ or $\Psi < \psi$		
func $(x \ t_S(\Phi)) \ m(\Psi)(\overline{y} \ \tau) \ \tau \ \{\text{return } e\}$ <i>nomono</i>			
Occurs check		$\Phi < \phi$	$\alpha < \tau$
$\frac{\phi = \overline{\tau} \quad \alpha_i < \tau_i}{(\text{type } \overline{\alpha} \ \tau_i) < \phi}$		$\frac{\tau \neq \alpha \quad \alpha \in \text{fv}(\tau)}{\alpha < \tau}$	

Fig. 23. Monomorphisability check

THEOREM 5.4 (BISIMULATION). *Let P ok and $\vdash P \mapsto P^\dagger$ with $P = \overline{D} \triangleright d$ and $P^\dagger = \overline{D}^\dagger \triangleright d^\dagger$. Then:*

- (a) *if $d \longrightarrow e$ then there exists e^\dagger such that $d^\dagger \longrightarrow e^\dagger$ and $\vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger$;*
- (b) *if $d^\dagger \longrightarrow e^\dagger$ then there exists e such that $d \longrightarrow e$ and $\vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger$.*

6 IMPLEMENTATION

We have made available a prototype implementation,¹ which contains FG and FGG type checkers and interpreters, and a monomorphiser from FGG to FG (including the *nomono* check). We wrote the implementation in Go to facilitate interactions with the Go designers and community. Our interface includes some extensions to our tiny syntax for FG and FGG, such as direct support for interface embedding, some primitive data types, and minimal I/O. Versions of all the presented examples have been tested using the implementation.

We took advantage of the implementation to perform extensive testing. FG evaluation results are compared to those using the official Go compiler, and the FG and FGG interpreters support dynamic checking of preservation and progress. To test monomorphisation, we added the test of bisimulation depicted in Figure 24: given a well-typed FGG program we generate its FG monomorphisation; we step the FGG and FG terms and confirm that the new FGG term monomorphises to the new FG term; and repeat until termination.

Besides handcrafted examples and stress tests, we used NEAT [Claessen et al. 2015; Duregård 2016] to lazily enumerate all well-typed programs (up to some size relative to the total number of occurrences of method and type symbols) from a subset of FGG (similar to SMALL-CHECK [Runciman et al. 2008]). The subset consists of programs which have: (1) at least one method and one field; (2) at most one empty interface; and (3) at most two empty structs. And where: (1) each method has at most two arguments; (2) each struct has at most two fields; (3) each interface has at most two members and two parents; and (4) each method or type constructor has at most two type parameters. Moreover, we disallow mutually recursive type definitions. These measures are taken to truncate the space of possible programs. We generate all FGG programs in our subset up to size 20, and confirm they pass the bisimulation test described above.

¹<https://github.com/rhu1/fgg/>




Fig. 24. Bisimulation

7 RELATED WORK

This paper is the first to present a core formalism for the Go language. Our presentation is styled after that of Featherweight Java by Igarashi et al. [2001]. Like them, we focus on a tiny, functional subset of the language; we define versions with and without generics; and we consider translation from one to the other. We also mark as “stupid” casts/type assertions that are disallowed in source but are required for reduction to preserve types.

Our work resembles the development of generics for Java by Bracha et al. [1998] and for .NET by [Kennedy and Syme 2001] in that we build on a well-established base language. We note that in Featherweight Go, Featherweight Generic Go (and in the Go language), since method signatures are nonvariant, there are no fundamental decidability issues related to F-bounded polymorphism and variance [Pierce 1992], and so there is no need to consider more sophisticated techniques such as those of Greenman et al. [2014] to ensure decidability of type checking.

In terms of formalisations of generics, prior work on generics adopts one, or a combination, of three main approaches, *erasure*, *runtime representation of types as values*, and *monomorphisation*.

Erasure. Bracha et al. [1998] present a translation from Java with generics to Java without generics that erases all information about type parameters. The translation relies on *bridge methods*, which in turn rely on method overloading, which is not supported in Go. Igarashi et al. [1999] formalised the translation for the FJ subset of Java (avoiding bridge methods) and proved it preserves typing and reductions. Downsides of erasure are that casts to generic types must be restricted and creation of generic arrays becomes tricky (see [Naftalin and Wadler 2006]). Moreover, erased code is often less efficient than monomorphised code. An upside is that erasure is linear in the size of the source, whereas monomorphisation can lead to an explosion in code size.

Runtime representation. In contrast to Java erasure, Kennedy and Syme [2001] developed an extension of the .NET Common Language Runtime (CLR) and C# with direct support for generics. They generate a mixture of specialised and shared code: the former is compiled separately for each primitive type and is similar to monomorphisation; the latter is compiled once for every object type and is similar to erasure. JIT compilation is exploited to perform specialisation *dynamically*, avoiding potential code bloat. Code sharing is implemented by storing runtime *type-reps* [Crory et al. 1998] for type parameters.

The overhead of runtime assembly of type-reps can be optimised by pre-computing and caching maps from open types to their reps when a generic type or method is instantiated [Kennedy and Syme 2001; Viroli and Natali 2000]. In future work, we will also look to techniques of optimising the coexistence of uniform (boxed) and non-uniform representations in polymorphic code [Leroy 1992] for dealing with the analogous mixture of struct and interface values in generic Go code.

Monomorphisation. Although monomorphisation has been employed for languages such as C++, Standard ML and Rust [Turun 2015], we found a relative lack of peer-reviewed literature on this

topic. This section discusses works related to monomorphisation that do not state or prove any correctness results.

[Stroustrup \[2013, Chapter 26\]](#) describes template instantiation in C++. It is widely used, and infamous for code bloat.

[Benton et al. \[1998\]](#) describes a whole-program compiler from SML'97 to Java bytecode, where polymorphism is fully monomorphised. Monomorphisation is always possible, since Standard ML rules out polymorphic recursion (unlike FGJ). [Fluet \[2015\]](#) sketches a similar approach used in the SML optimising compiler MLton.

[Tolmach and Oliva \[1998, Section 6\]](#) develop a typed translation from an ML-like language to Ada, based on monomorphisation and presented in detail. Unlike us, they do not address subtyping (structural or otherwise) and they presume the absence of polymorphic recursion.

[Jones \[1995\]](#) describes the use of specialisation to efficiently compile type classes for Haskell, which bears some resemblance to monomorphisation.

Formalisation. We now consider works that formalise some aspect of monomorphisation.

[Yu et al. \[2004\]](#) formalise the mixed specialisation and sharing mechanisms of the .NET JIT compiler [[Kennedy and Syme 2001](#)]. The work describes a type and semantics preserving translation to a *polymorphic* .NET Intermediate Language (IL), where polymorphic behaviours are driven by *type-reps* [[Crary et al. 1998](#)], codifying runtime type data that can be used in e.g. dynamic casts. Their approach only generates code where type variables are instantiated with basic data types, using a uniform (i.e. boxed) representation for all other types. This sidesteps the key challenges of monomorphising code with polymorphic recursion and parameterised methods. Notably, [Kennedy and Syme \[2001\]](#) state that “some polymorphism simply cannot be specialized statically (polymorphic recursion, first-class polymorphism)”. In contrast, we present an algorithm that can determine whether monomorphisation is possible in the presence of polymorphic recursion.

[Siek and Taha \[2006\]](#) formalise the C++ template instantiation mechanism. They model partial specialization, template parameterisation and instantiation, and prove type soundness of template expansion. Unlike us, they do not state or prove bisimulation or preservation of reductions. Since C++ templates are Turing-complete, their soundness results are modulo termination, whereas our algorithms are guaranteed to terminate (see [Theorem 5.1](#) and [Appendix C.3](#)).

[Tanaka et al. \[2018, Section 2\]](#) report on a monomorphisation algorithm for Coq (Gallina) used in generation of low-level C code. Unlike us, they do not test for polymorphic recursion.

Monomorphisation and logic. In a related area, [Blanchette et al. \[2016\]](#); [Bobot and Paskevich \[2011\]](#) study monomorphisation for polymorphic first-order logic formulas, targeting the untyped or multi-sorted logics found in automated theorem provers.

8 CONCLUSION

In this work we studied generics for a minimal subset of Go and their compilation via monomorphisation. We chose monomorphisation since it is a simple first way of concretely explaining the semantics of generics using (simplified) Go and it avoids restrictions required by the erasure-based approach used in FGJ (e.g. type assertions on type variables). Another key benefit of monomorphisation is that of enabling 0-cost abstractions – programs that do not use generics incur no runtime penalty and generic code is translated into code that is equivalent to hand coded instantiations. The cost is that of requiring a whole program analysis and disallowing programs that would result in infinite instantiations ([Section 5.3](#)). Clearly, this is the beginning of the story, not the end.

In future work, we plan to look at other methods of implementation beside monomorphisation, and in particular we plan to consider an implementation based on passing runtime representations

of types, similar to that used for .NET generics [Kennedy and Syme 2001]. The idea is to automatically equip methods and structs with data that codifies type arguments used in generic code at runtime. For instance, a `Cons` struct would carry at runtime an additional field that specifies the type of the element contained in the cell, and a method that constructs a tree from a `List` would thread the runtime type information of the list cells into the tree. This approach requires translating all structs and methods of a program to account for runtime type passing and construction and thus the resulting programs can incur some runtime penalty. A mixed approach that uses monomorphisation sometimes and passing runtime representations sometimes might be best, again similar to that used for .NET generics. We will study the trade-offs and performance impact of this spectrum of approaches in future work.

Featherweight Go is restricted to a tiny subset of Go. We plan a model of other important features such as assignments, arrays, slices, and packages, which we will dub Bantamweight Go; and a model of Go's innovative concurrency mechanism based on "goroutines" and message passing, which we will dub Cruiserweight Go.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Nicholas Ng, Sam Lindley, and our referees for comments and suggestions. This work was funded under EPSRC EP/K034413/1, EP/T006544/1, EP/K011715/1, EP/L00058X/1, EP/N027833/1, EP/N028201/1, EP/T006544/1, EP/T014709/1 and EP/V000462/1, NCSS/EP SRC VeTSS, NOVA LINC (UIDB/04516/2020) with the financial support of FCT- Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, and EU MSCA-RISE BehAPI (ID:778233).

REFERENCES

- Nada Amin and Ross Tate. 2016. Java and Scala's type systems are unsound: the existential crisis of null pointers. In *Object-Oriented Programming: Systems, Languages, and Applications (OOPSLA)*. 838–848.
- Nick Benton, Andrew Kennedy, and George Russell. 1998. Compiling Standard ML to Java Bytecodes. In *Proceedings of the third ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP '98)*, Baltimore, Maryland, USA, September 27–29, 1998, Matthias Felleisen, Paul Hudak, and Christian Queinnec (Eds.). ACM, 129–140. <https://doi.org/10.1145/289423.289435>
- Jasmin Christian Blanchette, Sascha Böhme, Andrei Popescu, and Nicholas Smallbone. 2016. Encoding Monomorphic and Polymorphic Types. *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 12, 4 (2016).
- François Bobot and Andrey Paskevich. 2011. Expressing Polymorphic Types in a Many-Sorted Language. In *FroCoS (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 6989)*. Springer, 87–102.
- Gilad Bracha, Martin Odersky, David Stoutamire, and Philip Wadler. 1998. Making the Future Safe for the Past: Adding Genericity to the Java Programming Language. In *Proceedings of the 1998 ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Object-Oriented Programming Systems, Languages & Applications (OOPSLA '98)*, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, October 18–22, 1998. ACM, 183–200. <https://doi.org/10.1145/286936.286957>
- Peter Canning, William Cook, Walter Hill, Walter Olthoff, and John C Mitchell. 1989. F-bounded polymorphism for object-oriented programming. In *Functional Programming Languages and Computer Architecture (FPCA)*. 273–280.
- Henry Cejtin, Suresh Jagannathan, and Stephen Weeks. 2000. Flow-directed closure conversion for typed languages. In *European Symposium on Programming (ESOP)*. Springer, 56–71.
- Koen Claessen, Jonas Duregård, and Michał Palka. 2015. Generating constrained random data with uniform distribution. *Journal of Functional Programming* 25 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0956796815000143>
- William R Cook. 1990. Object-oriented programming versus abstract data types. In *Workshop of the REX Project (LNCS, Vol. 489)*. Springer, 151–178.
- Karl Cray, Stephanie Weirich, and J. Gregory Morrisett. 1998. Intensional Polymorphism in Type-Erasure Semantics. In *Proceedings of the third ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP '98)*, Baltimore, Maryland, USA, September 27–29, 1998. ACM, 301–312. <https://doi.org/10.1145/289423.289459>
- Sophia Drossopoulou and Susan Eisenbach. 1997. Java is type safe—probably. In *European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming*. Springer, 389–418.
- Jonas Duregård. 2016. *Automating Black-Box Property Based Testing*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Chalmers University of Technology.

- Matthew Flatt, Shriram Krishnamurthi, and Matthias Felleisen. 1998. Classes and Mixins. In *Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*. 171–183.
- Matthew Fluet. 2015. MLton – Monomorphise. <http://mlton.org/Monomorphise>.
- Ben Greenman, Fabian Muehlboeck, and Ross Tate. 2014. Getting F-bounded polymorphism into shape. In *ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI '14, Edinburgh, United Kingdom - June 09 - 11, 2014*. 89–99. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2594291.2594308>
- Robert Griesemer, Rob Pike, Ken Thompson, Ian Taylor, Russ Cox, Jini Kim, and Adam Langley. 2009. Hey! Ho! Let's Go! <https://opensource.googleblog.com/2009/11/hey-ho-lets-go.html>
- Atsushi Igarashi, Benjamin C. Pierce, and Philip Wadler. 1999. Featherweight Java: A Minimal Core Calculus for Java and GJ. In *Proceedings of the 1999 ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Object-Oriented Programming Systems, Languages & Applications (OOPSLA '99), Denver, Colorado, USA, November 1-5, 1999*, Brent Hailpern, Linda M. Northrop, and A. Michael Berman (Eds.). ACM, 132–146. <https://doi.org/10.1145/320384.320395>
- Atsushi Igarashi, Benjamin C. Pierce, and Philip Wadler. 2001. Featherweight Java: a minimal core calculus for Java and GJ. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* 23, 3 (2001), 396–450. <https://doi.org/10.1145/503502.503505>
- Mark P Jones. 1995. Dictionary-free overloading by partial evaluation. *Lisp and Symbolic Computation* 8, 3 (1995), 229–248.
- Andrew Kennedy and Don Syme. 2001. Design and Implementation of Generics for the .NET Common Language Runtime. In *Proceedings of the 2001 ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI), Snowbird, Utah, USA, June 20-22, 2001*. ACM, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/378795.378797>
- Shriram Krishnamurthi, Matthias Felleisen, and Daniel P Friedman. 1998. Synthesizing object-oriented and functional design to promote re-use. In *European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming (ECOOP)*. Springer, 91–113.
- Xavier Leroy. 1992. Unboxed Objects and Polymorphic Typing. In *Conference Record of the Nineteenth Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA, January 19-22, 1992*. ACM Press, 177–188. <https://doi.org/10.1145/143165.143205>
- Maurice Naftalin and Philip Wadler. 2006. *Java generics and collections*. O'Reilly. <http://www.oreilly.de/catalog/javagenerics/index.html>
- Tobias Nipkow and David von Oheimb. 1998. Javalight is Type-safe—Definitely. In *Principles of Programming Languages (POPL)*. 161–170.
- Benjamin C. Pierce. 1992. Bounded Quantification is Undecidable. In *Conference Record of the Nineteenth Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA, January 19-22, 1992*. 305–315. <https://doi.org/10.1145/143165.143228>
- John C Reynolds. 1994. User-defined types and procedural data structures as complementary approaches to data abstraction. In *New Directions in Algorithmic Languages*. MIT Press, 13–23.
- Colin Runciman, Matthew Naylor, and Fredrik Lindblad. 2008. Smallcheck and lazy smallcheck. In *Proceedings of the first ACM SIGPLAN symposium on Haskell - Haskell '08*. ACM Press. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1411286.1411292>
- Jeremy G. Siek and Walid Taha. 2006. A Semantic Analysis of C++ Templates. In *European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming (ECOOP) (LNCS, Vol. 4067)*. Springer, 304–327.
- Bjarne Stroustrup. 2013. *The C++ Programming Language, 4th Edition*. Addison-Wesley.
- Wouter Swierstra. 2008. Data types à la carte. *Journal of Functional Programming* 18, 4 (2008), 423–436.
- Don Syme. 1999. Proving Java Type Soundness. In *Formal Syntax and Semantics of Java*. Springer-Verlag, 83–118.
- Akira Tanaka, Reynald Affeldt, and Jacques Garrigue. 2018. Safe Low-level Code Generation in Coq Using Monomorphization and Monadification. *JIP* 26 (2018), 54–72.
- Ian Lance Taylor and Robert Griesemer. 2019. Contracts — Draft Design. <https://go.gosourcelab.com/proposal/+master/design/go2draft-contracts.md>
- Ian Lance Taylor and Robert Griesemer. 2020. Type Parameters — Draft Design. <https://go.gosourcelab.com/proposal/+refs/heads/master/design/go2draft-type-parameters.md>
- The Go Team. 2020. The Go Programming Language Specification. <https://golang.org/ref/spec>
- The Rust Team. 2017. The Rust programming language. <http://rust-lang.org/>
- Andrew P. Tolmach and Dino Oliva. 1998. From ML to Ada: Strongly-Typed Language Interoperability via Source Translation. *Journal of Functional Programming* 8, 4 (1998), 367–412.
- Mads Torgersen. 2004. The expression problem revisited. In *European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming (ECOOP)*. Springer, 123–146.
- Aaron Turon. 2015. Abstraction without overhead: traits in Rust. <https://blog.rust-lang.org/2015/05/11/traits.html>
- Mirko Viroli and Antonio Natali. 2000. Parametric polymorphism in Java: an approach to translation based on reflective features. In *Proceedings of the 2000 ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Object-Oriented Programming Systems, Languages & Applications (OOPSLA 2000), Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA, October 15-19, 2000*. ACM, 146–165. <https://doi.org/10.1145/353171.353182>
- Philip Wadler. 1998. The expression problem. Posted on the Java Genericity mailing list. <http://homepages.inf.ed.ac.uk/wadler/papers/expression/expression.txt>

- Dachuan Yu, Andrew Kennedy, and Don Syme. 2004. Formalization of generics for the .NET common language runtime. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2004, Venice, Italy, January 14-16, 2004*. ACM, 39–51. <https://doi.org/10.1145/964001.964005>
- Matthias Zenger and Martin Odersky. 2004. *Independently extensible solutions to the expression problem*. Technical Report.

```

type Any interface {}
type Eq interface {
    Equal(that Eq) Bool
}
type Bool interface {
    Not() Bool
    Equal(that Eq) Bool
    Cond(br Branches) Any
}
type Branches interface {
    IfTT() Any
    IfFF() Any
}

type TT struct {}
type FF struct {}

func (this TT) Not() Bool { return FF{} }
func (this FF) Not() Bool { return TT{} }

func (this TT) Equal(that Eq) Bool { return that.(Bool) }
func (this FF) Equal(that Eq) Bool { return that.(Bool).Not() }

func (this TT) Cond(br Branches) Any { return br.IfTT() }
func (this FF) Cond(br Branches) Any { return br.IfFF() }

```

Fig. 25. Booleans in FG

A FURTHER EXAMPLES

A.1 Booleans in FG

Figure 25 shows how to implement booleans in FG. We begin by declaring two general-purpose interfaces. Interface `Any` has no methods, and so is implemented by any type. Interface `Eq` has one method with signature `Equal(that Eq) Bool`, an equality test that accepts an argument which is itself of type `Eq` and returns a boolean.

Interface `Bool` has three methods. Method `Not() Bool` computes the logical negation of its receiver. Method `Equal(that Eq) Bool` checks whether its receiver is equal to its argument. Method `Cond(br Branches) Any` executes one of two branches depending on whether the receiver is true or false. It refers to interface `Branches`, which has two methods with signatures `IfTT() Any` and `IfFF() Any`, one to be invoked for a true conditional and one to be invoked for a false conditional.

Go also supports *interface embedding*. Mentioning one interface in another stands for all the methods declared in the first. For example, the `Bool` interface in the figure is equivalent to:

```

type Bool interface {
    Not() Bool
    Eq
    Cond(br Branches) Any
}

```

where the method specification for `Equal` has been replaced by the interface `Eq`. We use interface embedding in examples, but our formalism for FG assumes each interface embedding is expanded out to the corresponding method specifications.

We then define two structure types, `TT` and `FF`, each with no fields, and methods are defined with receivers of both types for each of the three methods `Not`, `Equal`, and `Cond`. Since they have methods whose signatures match those in interface `Bool`, we say that structure types `TT` and `FF` both *implement* the interface `Bool`.

Method `Not` returns false on receiver true, and true on receiver false. For instance, `TT{}.Not()` returns `FF{}`.

Method `Equal` returns its argument on true and the negation of its argument on false. The type assertion `that.(Bool)` returns the argument that if it implements the interface `Bool` and panics otherwise, where *panic* is Go jargon for indicating a runtime error has occurred. For instance, `b.Equal(b)` returns true if `b` is a boolean, while `b.Equal(x)` panics if `b` is a boolean but `x` is not.

Finally, method `Cond` invokes either `IfTT()` or `IfFF()` on its argument, depending on whether the receiver is true or false. For instance, assume `x` has type `Eq` and `xs` has type `Cons`, and that `Equal` and `Contains` are both methods that return booleans. The conditional

```
if x.Equal(xs.head) {
    return true
} else {
    return xs.tail.Contains(x)
}
```

can be emulated in FG by introducing the declarations

```
type containsBr struct {
    xs List
    x Eq
}
func (this containsBr) IfTT() Bool { return TT{} }
func (this containsBr) IfFF() Bool { return this.xs.tail.Contains(this.x) }
```

and writing

```
return x.Equal(xs.head).Cond(containsBr{x,xs}).(Bool)
```

The type assertion `.(Bool)` is required since otherwise the type of the expression would be `Any`, whereas `Bool` is expected. As one would expect, method `Contains` is called only when the condition is true.

A.2 Booleans in FGG

Booleans are adapted to generics in Figure 26. Interface `Any` is unchanged. The interface for equality is now written `Eq(type a Eq(a))`, indicating that it accepts a type parameter. A type parameter is always followed by an interface that it must implement, which is called its *bound*. Often the bound is `Any`, but in this case, the bound on `a` is itself `Eq(a)`. For instance, we will see that `Bool` implements `Eq(Bool)`. But `Any` does not implement `Eq(Any)`, so the latter is not a valid type. The situation where a type parameter appears in its own bound is known as *F-bounded polymorphism* [Canning et al. 1989], and a similar idiom is common in Java with generics [Bracha et al. 1998; Naftalin and Wadler 2006].

In interface `Bool`, the signature for negation is unchanged. The signature for equality is now `Equal(that Bool) Bool`, where the argument type has now been refined from `Eq` to `Bool`. The signature for conditionals is now

```
Cond(type a Any)(br Branches(a)) a
```

```

type Any interface {}
type Eq(type a Eq(a)) interface {
    Equal(that a) Bool
}
type Bool interface {
    Not() Bool
    Equal(that Bool) Bool
    Cond(type a Any)(br Branches(a)) a
}
type Branches(type a Any) interface {
    IfTT() a
    IfFF() a
}

type TT struct {}
type FF struct {}

func (this TT) Not() Bool { return FF{} }
func (this FF) Not() Bool { return TT{} }

func (this TT) Equal(that Bool) Bool { return that }
func (this FF) Equal(that Bool) Bool { return that.Not() }

func (this TT) Cond(type a Any)(br Branches(a)) a { return br.IfTT() }
func (this FF) Cond(type a Any)(br Branches(a)) a { return br.IfFF() }

```

Fig. 26. Booleans in FGG

where method `Cond` now accepts a type parameter, with bound `Any`. Its argument type has been refined from type `Branches` to type `Branches(a)`, and its result has been refined from type `Any` to type `a`. Using interface embedding, we could equivalently write the interface as

```

type Bool interface {
    Not() Bool
    Eq(Bool)
    Cond(type a Any)(br Branches(a)) a
}

```

which includes all members of the `Eq(Bool)` interface in the `Bool` interface.

The interface for branches now also takes a type parameter, `Branch(type a Any)`, and the signatures of its methods are now `IfTT() a` and `IfFF() a`, where the result types have been refined from `Any` to `a`.

The two structure types, `TT` and `FF` are just as before, as is the method for logical negation. The method for equality are as before, save that the argument type has changed from `Eq` to `Bool`. The type assertions previously required to convert the argument to a boolean are no longer needed. Indeed, typing is now strong enough to assure a panic never occurs when evaluating equality.

Finally, the method for conditionals is as before, save for the refinement to its signature. Whereas in the previous example we wrote

```

return x.Equal(xs.head).Cond(containsBr{x,xs}).(Bool)

```

now we write

```

// Nil, Cons
type Nil(type a Any, c Any) struct {}
type Cons(type a Any, c Any) struct {
    head a
    tail c
}
// Map on Nil, Cons
type Mapper(type a Any) interface {
    Map(type b Any, d Any)(f Function(a,b)) d
}
func (xs Nil(type a Any, c Mapper(a)))
    Map(type b Any, d Any)(f Function(a,b)) d {
    return Nil(b,d){}
}
func (xs Cons(type a Any, c Mapper(a)))
    Map(type b Any, d Any)(f Function(a,b)) d {
    return Cons(b,d)
        {f.apply(xs.head), xs.tail.Map(b,d)(f)}
}

// Equality on Nil, Cons
type Eq(type a Eq(a)) interface {
    Equal(that a) bool
}
func (xs Nil(type a Eq(a), c Eq(c))) Equal(ys c) bool {
    ys, ok := ys.(Nil(a,c))
    return ok
}
func (xs Cons(type a Eq(a), c Eq(c))) Equal(ys c) bool {
    ys, ok := ys.(Cons(a,c))
    return ok && xs.head.Equal(ys.head)
        && xs.tail.Equal(ys.tail)
}
// tie it all together
type List(type a Eq(a)) interface {
    Mapper(a)
    Eq(List(a))
}

```

Fig. 27. Lists in the style of the expression problem

```
return x.Equal(xs.head).Cond(Bool)(containsBr{x,xs})
```

Method `Cond` now takes a type parameter `Bool` specifying its result type, so the type assertion `.(Bool)` can be removed.

A.3 Lists in the style of The Expression Problem

We now present an alternative design that permits a list with elements of any type when `Map` is the only operation applied to the list, but requires elements to support equality when `Equal` is applied.

Our alternative solution for lists appears in Figure 27. Structures `Nil` and `Cons` now take not one but two type parameters, both bounded by interface `Any`. As before, parameter `a` is the type of the elements of the list (the `head` field of `Cons`), while the new parameter `c` is the type of the lists themselves (the `tail` field of `Cons`). The type parameters only appear in the definition of `Cons`, but we also add them to `Nil` because we may need to refer to them in the signatures of operations. (As it happens, `c` doesn't appear in the signatures here, but it would be needed if we wanted to define, for instance, a method to append two lists.)

To avoid pollution, for each operation, `Map` and `Equal` we define a corresponding interface to specify that operation, `Mapper` and `Eq`.

Method `Map` now takes not one but two type parameters, both bounded by interface `Any`. As before, parameter `b` is the type of the elements of the result list, while the new parameter `d` is the type of the result list itself. When defining `Map` on `Cons`, the receiver's first parameter `a` is bounded by `Any` and its second type parameter `c` is bounded by `Mapper(a)`, allowing `Map` to be recursively invoked on the tail.

When defining `Equal` on `Cons`, the receiver's first parameter `a` is bounded by `Eq(a)`, allowing list elements to be tested for equality, and its second type parameter `c` is bounded by `Eq(c)`, allowing `Equal` to be recursively invoked on the tail.

The bodies of the methods for equality use a second form of type assertion which returns both a value of the asserted type (`xs`, `rebound`) and a boolean saying whether the assertion succeeded (`ok`). Unlike the other form of type assertions, these can never panic, and so are not an issue with regard to static type checking. They are not included in our formalisations of FG and FGG, but would be easy to add.

As in the expression problem, for both `Map` and `Equal` it is crucial that bounds on the type receiver are covariant. Since the bounds on the parameters in `Nil` and `Cons` are `Any`, it is fine for the receivers to use tighter bounds, such as `Mapper` or `Eq`.

A last step shows how to tie it all together. We define an interface `List(a)` which embeds interfaces `Mapper(a)` and `Eq(List(a))`. At this point, the pollution occurs, and we bound type parameter `a` by interface `Eq(a)`, since we must be able to test list elements for equality.

Not all applications will require this level of flexibility, or desire the associated complexity. But it is good that this design pattern is supported, and it is easy to see it may be valuable in some situations.

B FG TYPE SOUNDNESS

This section develops FG type soundness in the form of Type Preservation by evaluation (Appendix B.1 and Progress (Appendix B.2)).

The various substitution properties are often stated more generally in this appendix for convenience (i.e., those in the main matter are special cases of the results developed here). We make use of a reduction relation that replaces the contextual rule R-CONTEXT with the equivalent set of rules that identify each possible reduction explicitly, implementing a left-to-right call-by-value semantics. Uses of these congruence rules are labelled with the prefix RC. The development of progress makes use of an inductively defined epanic predicate, which holds iff expression e causes a run-time panic (i.e., contains an invalid type assertion). This predicate is equivalent to the definition of *panics* from the main matter.

B.1 Type Preservation

LEMMA B.1 (WEAKENING). *If $\Gamma \vdash e : t$ then, for all $\Gamma' \supseteq \Gamma$, $\Gamma' \vdash e : t$.*

PROOF. Straightforward induction on $\Gamma \vdash e : t$. □

LEMMA B.2. *Let t ok. If $t <: t_S$ then $t = t_S$.*

PROOF. By definition of $<:$. □

LEMMA B.3. *If $mM \in \text{methods}(t)$ then, for all $t' <: t$, $mM \in \text{methods}(t')$.*

PROOF.

$$\text{methods}(t) \subseteq \text{methods}(t')$$

by definition of $<:$

$$mM \in \text{methods}(t')$$

by \subseteq

□

LEMMA B.4. *The $<:$ relation is reflexive and transitive.*

PROOF. Straightforward from the definition of $<:$. □

LEMMA B.5 (SUBSTITUTION). *If $\emptyset \vdash \bar{v} : \bar{t}$ and $\Gamma, \bar{x} : \bar{t}' \vdash e' : t_b$, where $\bar{t} <: \bar{t}'$, then $\Gamma \vdash e'[\bar{x} := \bar{v}] : t_c$, for some $t_c <: t_b$.*

PROOF. By induction on the derivation of $\Gamma, \bar{x} : \bar{t}' \vdash e' : t_b$.

Case: Rule T-VAR

$$e' = y \text{ and } t_b = \Gamma(y)$$

Subcase: $y \notin \bar{x}$

$$y[\bar{x} := \bar{v}] = y$$

by definition

$$\Gamma \vdash y : t_b$$

by T-VAR

$$t_b <: t_b$$

by reflexivity

Subcase: $y \in \bar{x}$

$$x[\bar{x} := \bar{v}] = v \text{ and } \Gamma(x) = t'$$

$$\Gamma \vdash v : t \text{ and } t <: t'$$

assumption and Lemma B.1

Case: Rule T-LITERAL

$$e' = t_S\{\overline{e_f}\}, t_b = t_S \text{ and } e'[\bar{x} := \bar{v}] = t_S\{e_f[\bar{x} := \bar{v}]\}$$

$$\Gamma, \bar{x} : \bar{t}' \vdash \overline{e_f} : \bar{t}_a$$

by inversion

$$\text{fields}(t_S) = f \ t_f$$

by inversion

$$\bar{t}_a <: \bar{t}_f$$

by inversion

$$\Gamma \vdash \overline{e_f[\bar{x} := \bar{v}]} : \bar{t}_c, \text{ for some } \bar{t}_c <: \bar{t}_a$$

by i.h.

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{t_c} &<: \overline{t_f} \\ \Gamma \vdash t_S \{e_f[\overline{x} := \overline{v}]\} : t_S \\ t_S &<: t_S \end{aligned}$$

by transitivity
by T-LITERAL
by reflexivity

Case: Rule T-FIELD

$$\begin{aligned} e' &= e_s.f, t_b = t_f \text{ and } e'[\overline{x} := \overline{v}] = e_s[\overline{x} := \overline{v}].f \\ \Gamma, \overline{x} : t' \vdash e_s : t_S \\ f t_f &\in \text{fields}(t_S) \\ \Gamma \vdash e_s[\overline{x} := \overline{v}] : t_b, \text{ for some } t_b <: t_S \\ t_b &= t_S \\ \Gamma \vdash e_s[\overline{x} := \overline{v}] : t_S \\ \Gamma \vdash e_s.f : t_f \\ t_f &<: t_f \end{aligned}$$

by inversion
by inversion
by i.h.
by Lemma B.2
substituting for equals
by T-FIELD
by reflexivity

Case: Rule T-CALL

$$\begin{aligned} e' &= e_c.m(\overline{e_a}), t_b = t_r \text{ and } e'[\overline{x} := \overline{v}] = e_c[\overline{x} := \overline{v}].m(\overline{e_a[\overline{x} := \overline{v}]}) \\ \Gamma, \overline{x} : t' \vdash e_c : t_c \\ m(\overline{x t_p}) t_r &\in \text{methods}(t_c) \\ \Gamma, \overline{x} : t' \vdash \overline{e_a} : t_a \\ \overline{t_a} &<: \overline{t_p} \\ \Gamma \vdash e_c[\overline{x} := \overline{v}] : t_d, \text{ for some } t_d <: t_c \\ m(\overline{x t_p}) t_r &\in \text{methods}(t_d) \\ \Gamma \vdash \overline{e_a[\overline{x} := \overline{v}]} : \overline{t_e}, \text{ for some } \overline{t_e} <: \overline{t_a} \\ \overline{t_e} &<: \overline{t_p} \\ \Gamma \vdash e_c[\overline{x} := \overline{v}].m(\overline{e_a[\overline{x} := \overline{v}]}) : t_r \\ t_r &<: t_r \end{aligned}$$

by inversion
by inversion
by inversion
by inversion
by i.h.
by Lemma B.3
by i.h.
by transitivity
by T-CALL
by reflexivity

Case: Rule T-ASSERT_I

$$\begin{aligned} e' &= e_a.(t_I), t_b = t_I \text{ and } e'[\overline{x} := \overline{v}] = e_a[\overline{x} := \overline{v}].(t_I) \\ t_I &\text{ ok} \\ \Gamma, \overline{x} : t' \vdash e_a : t'_I \\ \Gamma \vdash e_a[\overline{x} := \overline{v}] : t_a, \text{ for some } t_a <: t'_I \\ \text{Subcase: } t_a &= t_S, \text{ for some struct. type } t_S \\ e_a[\overline{x} := \overline{v}].(t_I) & \\ t_I &<: t_I \\ \text{Subcase: } t_a &= t''_I, \text{ for some interface type } t''_I \\ \Gamma \vdash e_a[\overline{x} := \overline{v}].(t_I) : t_I \\ t_I &<: t_I \end{aligned}$$

by inversion
by inversion
by i.h.
by T-STUPID
by reflexivity
by T-ASSERT_I
by reflexivity

Case: Rule T-ASSERT_S

$$\begin{aligned} e' &= e_a.(t_S), t_b = t_S \text{ and } e'[\overline{x} := \overline{v}] = e_a[\overline{x} := \overline{v}].(t_S) \\ t_S &\text{ ok} \\ \Gamma, \overline{x} : t' \vdash e_a : t_I \\ t_S &<: t_I \\ \Gamma \vdash e_a[\overline{x} := \overline{v}] : t_a, \text{ for some } t_a <: t_I \\ \text{Subcase: } t_a &= t'_S, \text{ for some struct. type } t'_S \\ \Gamma \vdash e_a[\overline{x} := \overline{v}].(t_S) : t_S \\ \text{Subcase: } t_a &= t'_I, \text{ for some interface type } t'_I \\ t'_I &= t_I \\ \Gamma \vdash e_a.(t_S) : t_S \end{aligned}$$

by inversion
by inversion
by inversion
by i.h.
by T-STUPID
by value restriction
by T-ASSERT_S

$t_S <: t_S$

by reflexivity

Case: Rule T-STUPID
$$\begin{aligned}
 &e' = e_a.(t), t_b = t \text{ and } e'[\bar{x} := \bar{v}] = e_a[\bar{x} := \bar{v}].(t) \\
 &t \text{ ok} \\
 &\Gamma, \bar{x} : t' \vdash e_a : t_S \\
 &\Gamma \vdash e_a[\bar{x} := \bar{v}] : t_c, \text{ for some } t_c <: t_S \\
 &t_c = t_S \\
 &\Gamma \vdash e_a[\bar{x} := \bar{v}].(t) : t \\
 &t <: t
 \end{aligned}$$

by inversion

by inversion

by i.h.

by Lemma B.2

by T-STUPID

by reflexivity

□

THEOREM B.6 (TYPE PRESERVATION). *If $\emptyset \vdash e : t$ and $e \longrightarrow e'$ then $\emptyset \vdash e : t'$, for some $t' <: t$.*

PROOF. By induction on the derivation of $e \longrightarrow e'$.

Case: Rule R-FIELD
$$\begin{aligned}
 &e = t_S\{\bar{e}_f\}.f_i, e' = e_{f_i}, t = t_{f_i} \\
 &\text{fields}(t_S) = \bar{f} \ t \\
 &\emptyset \vdash t_S\{\bar{e}_f\} : t_S \\
 &f \ t_f \in \text{fields}(t_S) \\
 &\emptyset \vdash \bar{e}_f : \bar{t}_a \\
 &\bar{t}_a <: t_f \\
 &\text{fields}(t_S) = \bar{f} \ t_f \\
 &\emptyset \vdash e_{f_i} : t_{a_i} \text{ and } t_{a_i} <: t_{f_i}
 \end{aligned}$$
by inversion on \longrightarrow

by inversion on typing

by inversion on typing

by inversion on typing

by inversion on typing

by inversion on typing

Case: Rule R-CALL
$$\begin{aligned}
 &e = t_S\{\bar{e}\}.m(\bar{e}_a), e' = e_0[x_0 := t_S\{\bar{e}\}][\bar{x} := \bar{e}_a], t = t_r \\
 &\text{body}(t_S.m) = (x_0 : t_S, \bar{x} : \bar{t}_p).e_0 \\
 &\emptyset \vdash t_S\{\bar{e}\} : t_S \\
 &m(\bar{x} \ \bar{t}_p) \ t_r \in \text{methods}(t_S) \\
 &\emptyset \vdash \bar{e}_a : \bar{t}_a \\
 &\bar{t}_a <: \bar{t}_p \\
 &x : t_S, \bar{x} : \bar{t}_p \vdash e_0 : t_1 \text{ with } t_1 <: t_r \\
 &\vdash e_0[x_0 := t_S\{\bar{e}\}][\bar{x} := \bar{e}_a] : t_2, \text{ for some } t_2 <: t_1 \\
 &t_2 <: t_r
 \end{aligned}$$
by inversion on \longrightarrow

by inversion on typing

by inversion on typing

by inversion on typing

by inversion on typing

by inversion on method typing

by Lemma B.5

by transitivity

Case: Rule R-ASSERT
$$\begin{aligned}
 &e = t_S\{\bar{e}\}.(t'), e' = t_S\{\bar{e}\}, t = t' \\
 &t_S <: t' \\
 &\emptyset \vdash t_S\{\bar{e}\} : t'
 \end{aligned}$$
by inversion on \longrightarrow

by inversion on typing

Case: Rule RC-RECV
$$\begin{aligned}
 &e = e_0.m(\bar{e}_a), e' = e'_0.m(\bar{e}_a), t = t_r \\
 &e_0 \longrightarrow e'_0 \\
 &\emptyset \vdash e_0 : t_0 \\
 &m(\bar{x} \ \bar{t}_p) \ t_r \in \text{methods}(t_0)
 \end{aligned}$$
by inversion on \longrightarrow

by inversion on typing

by inversion on typing

$\emptyset \vdash \overline{e_a} : \overline{t_a}$	by inversion on typing
$\overline{t_a} <: \overline{t_p}$	by inversion on typing
$\emptyset \vdash e_0 : t_1$, for some $t_1 <: t_0$	by i.h.
$m(\overline{x t_p}) t_r \in \text{methods}(t_1)$	by Lemma B.3
$\emptyset \vdash e'_0.m(\overline{e_a}) : t_r$	by T-CALL
$t_r <: t_r$	by reflexivity

Case: Rule RC-ARG

$e = e_0.m(\overline{e_a}), e' = e_0.m(\overline{e'_a}), t = t_r$	
$e_{a_i} \longrightarrow e'_{a_i}$	by inversion on \longrightarrow
$\emptyset \vdash e_0 : t_0$	by inversion on typing
$m(\overline{x t_p}) t_r \in \text{methods}(t_0)$	by inversion on typing
$\emptyset \vdash \overline{e_a} : \overline{t_a}$	by inversion on typing
$\overline{t_a} <: \overline{t_p}$	by inversion on typing
$\emptyset \vdash e'_{a_i} : t_1$, for some $t_1 <: t_{a_i}$	by i.h.
$t_1 <: t_{p_i}$	by transitivity
$\emptyset \vdash e_0.m(\overline{e'_a}) : t_r$	by T-CALL
$t_r <: t_r$	by reflexivity

Case: Rule RC-ASSERT

$e = e_0.(t'), e' = e'_0.(t'), t = t'$	
$e_0 \longrightarrow e'_0$	by inversion on \longrightarrow
$t' \text{ ok}$	by inversion on typing
Subcase: $\Gamma \vdash e_0 : t_I$	by inversion on typing
$\Gamma \vdash e'_0 : t_0$, for some $t_0 <: t_I$	by i.h.
Subsubcase: t_0 is an interface type and t' is a struct type	
$t_0 = t_I$ and $t' <: t_I$	by value restriction
$\Gamma \vdash e'_0.(t') : t'$	by T-ASSERT _S
Subsubcase: t_0 is an interface type and t' is an interface type	
$\Gamma \vdash e'_0.(t') : t'$	by T-ASSERT _I
Subsubcase: t_0 is a struct. type	
$\Gamma \vdash e'_0.(t') : t'$	by T-STUPID

□

B.2 Progress

The inductive definition of e panic is given below:

P-STRUCT	P-SEL	P-CALL-ARG	P-CALL-BODY
$\frac{}{e_i \text{ panic}}$	$\frac{}{e \text{ panic}}$	$\frac{}{e_i \text{ panic}}$	$\frac{}{e \text{ panic}}$
$t_S\{\overline{e}\} \text{ panic}$	$e.f \text{ panic}$	$v.m(\overline{e}) \text{ panic}$	$e.m(\overline{e}) \text{ panic}$
	P-ASSERT	P-CAST	
	$\frac{}{e \text{ panic}}$	$\frac{}{t_S \not\prec t}$	
	$e.(t) \text{ panic}$	$t_S\{\overline{v}\}.(t) \text{ panic}$	

LEMMA B.7 (CANONICAL FORMS). *If e is a value and $\emptyset \vdash e : t$ then $t = t_S$, for some t_S and $e = t_S\{\overline{v}\}$, for some \overline{v} .*

PROOF. Straightforward induction on typing. □

THEOREM B.8 (PROGRESS). *If $\emptyset \vdash e : t$ then either e is a value, e panic, or $e \longrightarrow e'$.*

PROOF. By induction on typing. We show two illustrative but standard cases and then all cases pertaining to type assertions.

Case: T-LITERAL

$\emptyset \vdash t_S\{\overline{e_f}\} : t_S$	this case
$\emptyset \vdash \overline{e_f} : \overline{t}$	by inversion
$fields(t_S) = f\ t_f$	by inversion
$\overline{t} <: \overline{t_f}$	by inversion
$\overline{e_{f_i}}$ is a value, e_{f_i} panic or $e_{f_i} \longrightarrow e'_{f_i}$	by i.h., for all such i
Subcase: e_{f_i} panic, for some i	
$t_S\{\overline{e_f}\}$ panic	by P-STRUCT
Subcase: e_{f_i} is a value, for all i	
$t_S\{\overline{e_f}\}$ is a value	by definition
Subcase: $e_f = \overline{v} \cdot e_i \cdot \overline{e_j}$, where $e_i \longrightarrow e'_i$	
$t_S\{\overline{e_f}\} \longrightarrow t_S\{\overline{v} \cdot e'_i \cdot \overline{e_j}\}$	by RC-LITERAL

Case: T-FIELD

$\emptyset \vdash e.f_i : t$	this case
$\emptyset \vdash e : t_S$	by inversion
$f_i t \in fields(t_S)$	by inversion
e is a value, e panic or $e \longrightarrow e'$	by i.h.
Subcase: e is a value	
$e = t_S\{\overline{v}\}$	by Lemma B.7
$t_S\{\overline{v}\}.f_i \longrightarrow v_i$	by R-FIELD
Subcase: e panic	
$e.f_i$ panic	by P-SEL
Subcase: $e \longrightarrow e'$	
$e.f_i \longrightarrow e'.f_i$	by RC-FIELD

Case: T-CALL

$\emptyset \vdash e.m(\overline{e_a}) : t_r$	this case
$\emptyset \vdash e : t$	by inversion
$m(\overline{x\ t_p})\ t_r \in methods(t)$	by inversion
$\emptyset \vdash \overline{e_a} : \overline{t_a}$	by inversion
$\overline{t_a} <: \overline{t_p}$	by inversion
e is a value, e panic or $e \longrightarrow e'$	by i.h.
Subcase: e panic	
$e.m(\overline{e_a})$ panic	by P-CALL-BODY
Subcase: $e \longrightarrow e'$	
$e.m(\overline{e_a}) \longrightarrow e'.m(\overline{e_a})$	by RC-RECV
Subcase: e is a value	
$e = t_S\{\overline{v}\}$	by Lemma B.7, for some t_S and \overline{v}
$\overline{e_{a_i}}$ is a value, e_{a_i} panic or $e_{a_i} \longrightarrow e'_{f_i}$	by i.h., for all such i
Subsubcase: $\overline{e_{a_i}}$ is a value, for all i	
$body(t_S.m) = (x, \overline{x}).e_b$, for some e_b	since $m(\overline{x\ t_p})\ t_r \in methods(t_S)$
$e.m(\overline{e_a}) \longrightarrow e_b[x := e][\overline{x} := \overline{e_a}]$	by R-CALL
Subsubcase: e_{a_i} panic, for some i	
$e.m(\overline{e_a})$ panic	by P-CALL-ARG
Subsubcase: $e_a = \overline{v'} \cdot e_i \cdot \overline{e_j}$, where $e_i \longrightarrow e'_i$	

$t_S\{\bar{v}\}.m(\bar{v}' \cdot e_i \cdot \bar{e}_j) \longrightarrow t_S\{\bar{v}\}.m(\bar{v}' \cdot e'_i \cdot \bar{e}_j)$ by RC-ARG

Case: T-ASSERT_I

$\emptyset \vdash e.(t_I) : t_I$

this case

$\emptyset \vdash e : t'_I$

by inversion

e is a value, e panic or $e \longrightarrow e'$

by i.h.

Subcase: e is a value

Impossible, deriving a contradiction with Lemma B.7.

Subcase: e panic

$e.(t_I)$ panic

by P-ASSERT

Subcase: $e \longrightarrow e'$

$e.(t_I) \longrightarrow e'.(t_I)$

by RC-ASSERT

Case: T-ASSERT_S

$\emptyset \vdash e.(t_S) : t_S$

this case

$\emptyset \vdash e : t_I$

by inversion

$t_S <: t_I$

by inversion

e is a value, e panic or $e \longrightarrow e'$

by i.h.

Subcase: e is a value

Impossible, deriving a contradiction with Lemma B.7.

Subcase: e panic

$e.(t_S)$ panic

by P-ASSERT

Subcase: $e \longrightarrow e'$

$e.(t_S) \longrightarrow e'.(t_S)$

by RC-ASSERT

Case: T-STUPID

$\emptyset \vdash e.(t) : t$

this case

$\emptyset \vdash e : t_S$

by inversion

e is a value, e panic or $e \longrightarrow e'$

by i.h.

Subcase: e is a value

$e = t_S\{\bar{v}\}$

by Lemma B.7 and \bar{v}

$e.(t)$ panic

by P-CAST

Subcase: e panic

$e.(t)$ panic

by P-ASSERT

Subcase: $e \longrightarrow e'$

$e.(t) \longrightarrow e'.(t)$

by RC-ASSERT

□

C FGG TYPE SOUNDNESS

This section develops FGG type soundness in the form of Type Preservation by evaluation (Appendix C.1 and Progress (Appendix C.2)).

The various substitution properties are often stated more generally in this appendix for convenience (i.e., those in the main matter are special cases of the results developed here). We make use of a reduction relation that replaces the contextual rule **R-CONTEXT** with the equivalent set of rules that identify each possible reduction explicitly, implementing a left-to-right call-by-value semantics. Uses of these congruence rules are labelled with the prefix **rc**. The development of progress makes use of an inductively defined *e* panic predicate, which holds iff expression *e* causes a run-time panic (i.e., contains an invalid type assertion). This predicate is equivalent to the definition of *panics* from the main matter.

C.1 Type Preservation

Below we write $\Phi, \overline{\alpha} : \overline{\tau}_I$ under the assumption that $\text{distinct}(\hat{\Phi}, \overline{\alpha})$ and treat typing contexts and Δ and type formalis Φ, Ψ interchangeably, as in the rules of Section 4.

LEMMA C.1 (WEAKENING). *Let $\Delta \vdash \overline{\tau}_I$ ok and $\Delta \vdash \overline{\tau}_0$ ok. Then:*

- (1) $\Delta \vdash \tau$ ok implies $\Delta, \overline{\alpha} : \overline{\tau}_I \vdash \tau$ ok;
- (2) $\Delta \vdash \Psi$ ok implies $\Delta, \overline{\alpha} : \overline{\tau}_I \vdash \Psi$ ok and $\Delta \vdash \Psi, \overline{\alpha} : \overline{\tau}_I$ ok;
- (3) $\Delta; \Psi$ ok Δ' implies $\Delta; \Psi, \overline{\alpha} : \overline{\tau}_I$ ok ($\Delta', \overline{\alpha} : \overline{\tau}_I$);
- (4) $\Delta \vdash \tau_1 <: \tau_2$ implies $\Delta, \overline{\alpha} : \overline{\tau}_I \vdash \tau_1 <: \tau_2$;
- (5) $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau$ implies $\Delta, \overline{\alpha} : \overline{\tau}_I; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau$ and $\Delta; \Gamma, \overline{x} : \overline{\tau}_0 \vdash e : \tau$.

PROOF. Each statement above is proved by a straightforward induction on the given derivation. □

LEMMA C.2. *If $\Delta \vdash \tau <: \tau_S$, for some $\Delta \vdash \tau_S$ ok, then $\tau = \tau_S$.*

PROOF. Straightforward. □

LEMMA 4.1 (WELL FORMED). *If $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau$ then $\Delta \vdash \tau$ ok.*

PROOF. Straightforward induction on typing. □

LEMMA C.3. *Subtyping in FGG is reflexive and transitive, that is, (1) if $\Delta \vdash \tau$ ok then $\Delta \vdash \tau <: \tau$ and (2) if $\Delta \vdash \tau_1 <: \tau_2$ and $\Delta \vdash \tau_2 <: \tau_3$ then $\Delta \vdash \tau_1 <: \tau_3$*

PROOF. Straightforward induction on the definition of $<:$. □

LEMMA C.4. *Assume $\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha} : \overline{\tau}_I, \Delta_1 \vdash \tau$ ok and $\Delta_0 \vdash \overline{\tau}_0 <: \overline{\tau}_I[\overline{\alpha} := \overline{\tau}_0]$ with $\Delta_0 \vdash \overline{\tau}_0$ ok. Let $\eta = (\overline{\alpha} := \overline{\tau}_0)$, then $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \text{bounds}_{\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]}(\tau[\eta]) <: (\text{bounds}_{\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha} : \overline{\tau}_I, \Delta_1}(\tau))[\eta]$*

PROOF. By case analysis on the structure of τ .

Case: τ is a non-variable type

Trivial by reflexivity.

Case: τ is a type variable β and $\beta \in \Delta_0$

Immediate by reflexivity.

Case: τ is a type variable β and $\beta \in \Delta_1$

$$\text{bounds}_{\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]}(\tau[\eta]) = \text{bounds}_{\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]}(\beta)$$

$$= \Delta_1(\beta)[\eta] = (\text{bounds}_{\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha} : \overline{\tau}_I, \Delta_1}(\beta))[\eta]$$

$$\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \Delta_1(\beta)[\eta] <: \Delta_1(\beta)[\eta]$$

by definition
by definition
by reflexivity

Case: τ is a type variable β and $\beta \in \overline{\alpha}$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{bounds}_{\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]}(\tau[\eta]) = \text{bounds}_{\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]}(\tau_0) = \tau_0 && \text{by definition} \\
& (\text{bounds}_{\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha}:\overline{\tau_I}, \Delta_1}(\alpha))[\eta] = \tau_I[\eta] && \text{by definition} \\
& \Delta_0 \vdash \tau_0 <: \tau_I[\eta] && \text{assumption} \\
& \Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \tau_0 <: \tau_I[\eta] && \text{by Lemma C.1}
\end{aligned}$$

□

LEMMA C.5 (TYPE SUBSTITUTION PRESERVES SUBTYPING). *Assume $\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha}:\overline{\tau_I}, \Delta_1 \vdash \tau_1 <: \tau_2$, $\Delta_0 \vdash \overline{\tau_0}$ ok and $\Delta_0 \vdash (\overline{\tau_0} <: \overline{\tau_I})[\overline{\alpha} := \overline{\tau_0}]$ and let $\eta = (\overline{\alpha} := \overline{\tau_0})$. We have that $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \tau_1[\eta] <: \tau_2[\eta]$.*

PROOF. By induction on the derivation of $\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha}:\overline{\tau_I}, \Delta_1 \vdash \tau_1 <: \tau_2$.

Case: $<:_I$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tau_1 = \tau \text{ and } \tau_2 = \tau'_I && \text{this case} \\
& \text{methods}_{\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha}:\overline{\tau_I}, \Delta_1}(\tau) \supseteq \text{methods}_{\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha}:\overline{\tau_I}, \Delta_1}(\tau'_I) && \text{by inversion} \\
& \text{methods}_{\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]}(\tau[\eta]) \supseteq \text{methods}_{\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]}(\tau'_I[\eta]) && \text{by definition} \\
& \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \tau[\eta] <: \tau'_I[\eta] && \text{by rule } <:_I
\end{aligned}$$

Case: $<:-\text{PARAM}$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tau_1 = \tau_2 = \beta \in (\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha}:\overline{\tau_I}, \Delta_1) && \text{this case} \\
& \text{Subcase: } \beta \in \overline{\alpha} && \\
& \Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \tau_0 \text{ ok} && \text{by Lemma C.1} \\
& \Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \tau_0 <: \tau_0 && \text{by reflexivity} \\
& \text{Subcase: } \beta \notin \overline{\alpha} && \\
& \Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \beta <: \beta && \text{by rule } <:-\text{PARAM}
\end{aligned}$$

Case: $<:_S$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau_S && \text{this case} \\
& \Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \tau_S[\eta] <: \tau_S[\eta] && \text{by rule } <:_S
\end{aligned}$$

□

LEMMA C.6 (TYPE SUBSTITUTION PRESERVES WELL-FORMEDNESS). *Let $\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha}:\overline{\tau_I}, \Delta_1 \vdash \tau$ ok, $\Delta_0 \vdash \overline{\tau_0}$ ok, $\eta = (\overline{\alpha} := \overline{\tau_0})$ and $\Delta_0 \vdash (\overline{\tau_0} <: \overline{\tau_I})[\eta]$ then $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \tau[\eta]$ ok.*

PROOF. By induction on the derivation of $\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha}:\overline{\tau_I}, \Delta_1 \vdash \tau$ ok.

Case: T-NAMED

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tau = t(\overline{\tau'}) && \text{this case} \\
& \Delta_0, \overline{\alpha}:\overline{\tau_I}, \Delta_1 \vdash \overline{\tau'} \text{ ok} && \text{by inversion} \\
& (\text{type } t(\text{type } \beta \overline{\tau_I}) T) \in \overline{D} && \text{by inversion} \\
& \eta' = (\overline{\beta} \overline{\tau_I} :=_{\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha}:\overline{\tau_I}, \Delta_1} \overline{\tau'}) && \text{by inversion} \\
& \Delta_0, \overline{\alpha}:\overline{\tau_I}, \Delta_1 \vdash (\overline{\beta} <: \overline{\tau_I})[\overline{\beta} := \overline{\tau}] && \text{by inversion} \\
& \Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \overline{\tau'}[\eta] \text{ ok} && \text{by i.h.} \\
& \Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash (\overline{\beta} <: \overline{\tau_I}[\eta])[\overline{\beta} := \overline{\tau}[\eta]] && \text{by Lemma C.5} \\
& \Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash t(\overline{\tau'}[\eta]) \text{ ok} && \text{by rule T-NAMED}
\end{aligned}$$

Case: T-PARAM

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tau = \beta && \text{this case} \\
& \text{Subcase: } \beta \in \overline{\alpha} && \\
& \tau[\eta] = \tau_0 && \text{by definition} \\
& \Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \tau_0 \text{ ok} && \text{by Lemma C.1} \\
& \text{Subcase: } \beta \notin \overline{\alpha} && \\
& \tau[\eta] = \beta && \text{by definition}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \beta \text{ ok}$$

by rule T-PARAM

□

LEMMA C.7. If $\Delta \vdash \tau \text{ ok}$ and $m(\mathbf{type} \overline{\alpha \tau_I}) (\overline{y \tau_p}) \tau_r \in \text{methods}_\Delta(\tau)$ then for any τ_0 such that $\Delta \vdash \tau_0 <: \tau$ and $\Delta \vdash \tau_0 \text{ ok}$ we have that $m(\mathbf{type} \overline{\alpha \tau_I}) (\overline{y \tau_p}) \tau_r \in \text{methods}_\Delta(\tau_0)$

PROOF. By inversion on $\Delta \vdash \tau_0 <: \tau$.

Case: $<:_I$

$$\text{methods}_\Delta(\tau_0) \supseteq \text{methods}_\Delta(\tau)$$

by inversion

Subcase: τ_0 is some struct or interface type

$$m(\mathbf{type} \overline{\alpha \tau_I}) (\overline{y \tau_p}) \tau_r \in \text{methods}_\Delta(\tau_0)$$

by definition

Subcase: $\tau_0 = \alpha$

$$\text{methods}_\Delta(\tau_0) = \text{methods}_\Delta(\tau'_I), \text{ for some } \tau'_I \text{ such that } (\alpha : \tau'_I) \in \Delta$$

by definition

$$m(\mathbf{type} \overline{\alpha \tau_I}) (\overline{y \tau_p}) \tau_r \in \text{methods}_\Delta(\text{bounds}_\Delta(\tau_0))$$

by above reasoning

Case: $<:_S$

Trivial since $\tau_0 = \tau = \tau_S$, for some τ_S .

Case: $<:_\text{PARAM}$

Trivial since $\tau_0 = \tau = \alpha$.

□

LEMMA C.8. Let $m(\mathbf{type} \overline{\beta \tau_I}) (\overline{y \tau_p}) \tau_r \in \text{methods}_{\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha : \tau_I}, \Delta_1}(\tau_e)$, $\Delta_0 \vdash \overline{\tau_0} \text{ ok}$, $\eta = (\overline{\alpha} := \overline{\tau_0})$ and $\Delta_0 \vdash (\overline{\tau_0} <: \overline{\tau_I})[\eta]$. It follows that $m(\mathbf{type} \overline{\beta \tau_I}[\eta]) (\overline{y \tau_p}[\eta]) \tau_r[\eta] \in \text{methods}_{\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]}(\tau_e[\eta])$

PROOF. By the definition of *methods*, $(\eta = (\Psi :=_\Delta \psi))$ and Lemma C.5

□

LEMMA C.9 (TYPE SUBSTITUTION PRESERVES TYPING). Let $\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha : \tau_I}, \Delta_1; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau$, $\Delta_0 \vdash \overline{\tau_0} \text{ ok}$, $\eta = (\overline{\alpha} := \overline{\tau_0})$ and $\Delta_0 \vdash (\overline{\tau_0} <: \overline{\tau_I})[\eta]$. It follows that $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]; \Gamma[\eta] \vdash e[\eta] : \tau[\eta]$.

PROOF. By induction on the derivation of $\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha : \tau_I}, \Delta_1; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau$.

Case: T-VAR

$$\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]; \Gamma[\eta] \vdash x : \Gamma(x)[\eta]$$

trivially by T-VAR

Case: T-LITERAL

$$e = \tau'_S\{\overline{e}\} \text{ and } \tau = \tau'_S$$

this case

$$\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha : \tau_I}, \Delta_1 \vdash \tau'_S \text{ ok}, \Delta_0, \overline{\alpha : \tau_I}, \Delta_1; \Gamma \vdash \overline{e} : \overline{\tau}, \text{fields}(\tau'_S) = \overline{f \tau_f}, \Delta_0, \overline{\alpha : \tau_I}, \Delta_1 \vdash \overline{\tau} <: \overline{\tau_f}$$

by inversion

$$\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\overline{\alpha} := \overline{\tau_0}] \vdash \tau'_S[\overline{\alpha} := \overline{\tau_0}] \text{ ok}$$

by Lemma C.6

$$\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]; \Gamma[\eta] \vdash \overline{e}[\eta] : \overline{\tau}[\eta]$$

by i.h.

$$\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \overline{\tau}[\eta] <: \overline{\tau_f}[\eta]$$

by Lemma C.5

$$\text{fields}(\tau'_S[\eta]) = \overline{f \tau_f}[\eta]$$

by definition

$$\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]; \Gamma[\eta] \vdash \tau'_S[\eta]\{\overline{e}[\eta]\} : \tau'_S[\eta]$$

by T-LITERAL

Case: T-FIELD

$$e = e.f$$

this case

$$\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha : \tau_I}, \Delta_1; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau_S \text{ and } f \tau \in \text{fields}(\tau_S)$$

by inversion

$$\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]; \Gamma[\eta] \vdash e[\eta] : \tau_S[\eta]$$

by i.h.

$$f \tau[\eta] \in \text{fields}(\tau_S[\eta])$$

by definition

$$\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]; \Gamma[\eta] \vdash e[\eta].f : \tau[\eta]$$

by T-FIELD

Case: T-CALL

$e = e.m(\psi)(\bar{e})$ and $\tau = \tau_r[\eta']$ this case
 $m(\text{type } \beta \tau_I) (\overline{y \tau_p}) \tau_r \in \text{methods}_{\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha: \tau_I}, \Delta_1}(\tau_e)$ by inversion
 $\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha: \tau_I}, \Delta_1; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau_e$ by inversion
 $\eta' = ((\text{type } \beta \tau_I) :=_{(\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha: \tau_I}, \Delta_1)} \psi)$ and $\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha: \tau_I}, \Delta_1 \vdash (\bar{\beta} <: \overline{\tau_I})[\eta']$ by inversion
 $\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha: \tau_I}, \Delta_1; \Gamma \vdash \bar{e} : \overline{\tau_a}$ by inversion
 $\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha: \tau_I}, \Delta_1 \vdash (\overline{\tau_a} <: \overline{\tau_p})[\eta']$ by inversion
 $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]; \Gamma[\eta] \vdash e[\eta] : \tau_e[\eta]$ by i.h.
 $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \psi[\eta] <: \overline{\tau_I}[\eta'][\eta]$ by Lemma C.5
 $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]; \Gamma[\eta] \vdash \bar{e}[\eta] : \overline{\tau_a}[\eta]$ by i.h.
 $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \overline{\tau_a}[\eta'][\eta] <: \overline{\tau_p}[\eta'][\eta]$ by Lemma C.5
 $m(\text{type } \beta \tau_I[\eta]) (\overline{y \tau_p}[\eta]) \tau_r[\eta] \in \text{methods}_{\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]}(\tau_e[\eta])$ by Lemma C.8
 Let $\eta'' = (\eta \circ \eta')$
 $\eta'' = ((\text{type } \beta \tau_I[\eta'][\eta]) :=_{(\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta])} \psi[\eta'][\eta])$ by definition of $\eta = (\Psi :=_{\Delta} \psi)$ and above
 $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]; \Gamma[\eta] \vdash e[\eta].m(\psi[\eta])(\bar{e}[\eta]) : \tau_r[\eta'][\eta]$ by rule T-CALL

Case: T-ASSERT_I

$e = e.(\tau'_I)$ and $\tau = \tau'_I$ this case
 $\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha: \tau_I}, \Delta_1 \vdash \tau'_I \text{ ok}$ and $\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha: \tau_I}, \Delta_1; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau'_I$ by inversion
 $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \tau'_I[\eta] \text{ ok}$ by Lemma C.6
 $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]; \Gamma[\eta] \vdash e[\eta] : \tau'_I[\eta]$ by i.h.
 $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]; \Gamma[\eta] \vdash e[\eta].(\tau'_I[\eta]) : \tau'_I[\eta]$ by rule T-ASSERT_I

Case: T-ASSERT_S

$e = e.(\tau_S)$ and $\tau = \tau_S$ this case
 $\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha: \tau_I}, \Delta_1 \vdash \tau_S \text{ ok}$ by inversion
 $\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha: \tau_I}, \Delta_1; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau'_I$ by inversion
 $\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha: \tau_I}, \Delta_1 \vdash \tau_S <: \text{bounds}_{\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha: \tau_I}, \Delta_1}(\tau'_I)$ by inversion
 $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \tau_S[\eta] \text{ ok}$ by Lemma C.6
 $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \tau_S[\eta] <: \text{bounds}_{\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha: \tau_I}, \Delta_1}(\tau'_I[\eta])$ by Lemma C.5
 $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \tau_S[\eta] <: \text{bounds}_{\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]}(\tau'_I[\eta])$ by Lemma C.4 and Lemma C.3
 $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]; \Gamma[\eta] \vdash e[\eta] : \tau'_I[\eta]$ by i.h.
 $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]; \Gamma[\eta] \vdash e[\eta].(\tau_S[\eta]) : \tau_S[\eta]$ by rule T-ASSERT_S

Case: T-STUPID

$e = e.(\tau)$ and $\tau = \tau$ this case
 $\Delta_0, \overline{\alpha: \tau_I}, \Delta_1 \vdash \tau_S \text{ ok}$ by inversion
 $\Delta_0, \alpha : \tau_I, \Delta_1; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau_S$ by inversion
 $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta] \vdash \tau_S[\eta] \text{ ok}$ by Lemma C.6
 $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]; \Gamma[\eta] \vdash e[\eta] : \tau_S[\eta]$ by i.h.
 $\Delta_0, \Delta_1[\eta]; \Gamma[\eta] \vdash e[\eta].(\tau[\eta]) : \tau[\eta]$ by rule T-STUPID

□

LEMMA C.10 (VALUE SUBSTITUTION PRESERVES TYPING). *If $\emptyset; \Gamma, \overline{x: \tau} \vdash e : \tau'$ and $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \overline{v_0} : \overline{\tau_0}$ where $\vdash \overline{\tau_0} <: \overline{\tau}$ then $\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash e[\overline{x := \overline{v_0}}] : \tau''$, for some τ'' with $\emptyset \vdash \tau'' <: \tau'$.*

PROOF. By induction on the derivation of $\emptyset; \Gamma, \overline{x} : \tau \vdash e : \tau'$.

Case: Rule T-VAR

$$e = y \text{ and } \tau' = \Gamma(y)$$

Subcase: $x \neq y$

$$y[\overline{x} := \overline{v_0}] = y$$

$$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash y : \tau$$

$$\emptyset \vdash \tau <: \tau$$

by definition

by T-VAR

by reflexivity

Subcase: $x = y$

$$x[\overline{x} := \overline{v_0}] = v_0 \text{ and } \Gamma(x) = \tau'$$

$$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash v : \tau_0 \text{ and } \tau_0 <: \tau'$$

assumption

Case: Rule T-LITERAL

$$e = \tau_S\{\overline{e_f}\}, \tau' = \tau_S \text{ and } e[\overline{x} := \overline{v_0}] = \tau_S\{e_f[\overline{x} := \overline{v_0}]\}$$

$$\emptyset; \Gamma, \overline{x} : \tau \vdash \overline{e_f} : \tau_a$$

$$fields(\tau_S) = f t_f$$

$$\tau_a <: \tau_f$$

$$\emptyset \vdash \tau_S \text{ ok}$$

$$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash \overline{e_f[\overline{x} := \overline{v_0}]} : \tau_c, \text{ for some } \emptyset \vdash \tau_c <: \tau_a$$

$$\emptyset \vdash \tau_c <: \tau_f$$

$$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash \tau_S\{e_f[\overline{x} := \overline{v_0}]\} : \tau_S$$

$$\emptyset \vdash \tau_S <: \tau_S$$

by inversion

by inversion

by inversion

by inversion

by i.h.

by transitivity

by T-LITERAL

by reflexivity

Case: Rule T-FIELD

$$e = e_s.f, \tau' = \tau_f \text{ and } e[\overline{x} := \overline{v_0}] = e_s[\overline{x} := \overline{v_0}].f$$

$$\emptyset; \Gamma, \overline{x} : \tau \vdash e_s : \tau_S$$

$$f t_f \in fields(\tau_S)$$

$$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash e_s[\overline{x} := \overline{v_0}] : t_b, \text{ for some } t_b <: \tau_S$$

$$t_b = \tau_S$$

$$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash e_s[\overline{x} := \overline{v_0}] : \tau_S$$

$$\emptyset \vdash \Gamma : e_s.f t_f$$

$$\emptyset \vdash t_f <: \tau_f$$

by inversion

by inversion

by i.h.

by Lemma C.2

substituting for equals

by T-FIELD

by reflexivity

Case: Rule T-CALL

$$m(\text{type } \overline{\alpha} \overline{\tau_I}) (\overline{y} \overline{\tau_p}) \tau_r \in methods_{\emptyset}(\tau_m)$$

$$\emptyset; \Gamma, \overline{x} : \tau \vdash e : \tau_m$$

$$\emptyset; \Gamma, \overline{x} : \tau \vdash \overline{e} : \tau_a$$

$$\eta = ((\text{type } \overline{\alpha} \overline{\tau_I}) := \psi)$$

$$\emptyset \vdash (\overline{\tau_a} <: \overline{\tau_p})[\eta]$$

$$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash e[\overline{x} := \overline{v_0}] : \tau'_m \text{ for some } \emptyset \vdash \tau'_m <: \tau_m$$

$$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash \overline{e[\overline{x} := \overline{v_0}]} : \tau'_a \text{ for some } \emptyset \vdash \tau'_a <: \tau_a$$

$$\emptyset \vdash \tau'_a <: \overline{\tau_p}[\eta]$$

$$m(\text{type } \overline{\alpha} \overline{\tau_I}) (\overline{y} \overline{\tau_p}) \tau_r \in methods_{\emptyset}(\tau'_m)$$

$$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash e[\overline{x} := \overline{v_0}].m(\psi)(\overline{e}[\overline{x} := \overline{v_0}]) : \tau_r[\eta]$$

by inversion

by inversion

by inversion

by inversion

by inversion

by i.h.

by i.h.

by transitivity

by Lemma C.7

by rule T-CALL

Case: Rule T-ASSERT_I

$$\emptyset \vdash \tau_I \text{ ok and } \emptyset; \Gamma, \overline{x} : \tau \vdash e : \tau'_I$$

$$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash e[\overline{x} := \overline{v_0}] : \tau'' \text{ with } \emptyset \vdash \tau'' <: \tau'_I$$

Subcase: τ'' is an interface type

$$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash e[\overline{x} := \overline{v_0}].(\tau_I) : \tau_I$$

by inversion

by i.h.

by rule T-ASSERT_I

Subcase: τ'' is some struct type τ_S

$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash e[\bar{x} := \bar{v}_0] : \tau_I$

by rule T-STUPID

Case: Rule T-ASSERT_S

$\emptyset \vdash \tau_S \text{ ok}$

by inversion

$\emptyset; \Gamma, \bar{x} : \bar{\tau} \vdash e : \tau_I$

by inversion

$\emptyset \vdash \tau_S <: \text{bounds}_\emptyset(\tau_I)$

by inversion

$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash e[\bar{x} := \bar{v}_0] : \tau''$ with $\emptyset \vdash \tau'' <: \tau_I$

by i.h.

Subcase: τ'' is an interface type

$\tau'' = \tau_I$

by value restriction

$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash e[\bar{x} := \bar{v}_0] : \tau_S$

by T-ASSERT_S

Subcase: τ'' is a struct type

$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash e[\bar{x} := \bar{v}_0] : \tau_S$

by T-STUPID

Case: Rule T-STUPID

$\emptyset \vdash \tau_S \text{ ok}$

by inversion

$\emptyset; \Gamma, \bar{x} : \bar{\tau} \vdash e : \tau_S$

by inversion

$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash e[\bar{x} := \bar{v}_0] : \tau''$ such that $\emptyset \vdash \tau'' <: \tau_S$

by i.h.

τ'' is a struct type

by Lemma C.2

$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash e[\bar{x} := \bar{v}_0] : \tau$

by rule T-STUPID

□

LEMMA C.11. If $m(\text{type } \bar{\alpha} \bar{\tau}_I) (\bar{y} \bar{\tau}_p) \tau_r \in \text{methods}(t_S(\bar{\tau}_I))$ and $\text{body}_\Delta(t_S(\bar{\tau}_I).m(\bar{\tau}_m)) = (x, \bar{y}).e_0$ where $\Delta \vdash t_S(\bar{\tau}_I) \text{ ok}$, $\Delta \vdash \bar{\tau}_m \text{ ok}$ and $\Delta \vdash \bar{\tau}_m <: \tau_I[\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau}_m]$ then there exists τ' such that $\Delta \vdash \tau' \text{ ok}$, $\Delta \vdash \tau' <: \tau_r[\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau}_m]$ and $\Delta; \bar{y} : \bar{\tau}_p[\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau}_m], x : t_S(\bar{\tau}_I) \vdash e_0 : \tau'$.

PROOF.

$(x, \bar{y}).e_0 = (x, \bar{y}).e'_0[\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau}_m][\hat{\Phi} := \bar{\tau}_I]$

by inversion on *body*

func $(x t_S(\Phi)) m(\text{type } \bar{\alpha} \bar{\tau}_I) (\bar{y} \bar{\tau}_p) \tau_r \{\text{return } e'_0\} \in \bar{D}$

by inversion on *body*

$\Phi, \bar{\alpha} : \bar{\tau}_I; x : t_S(\Phi), \bar{y} : \bar{\tau}_p \vdash e'_0 : \tau$

by inversion on well-formedness

$\Phi, \bar{\alpha} : \bar{\tau}_I \vdash \tau <: \tau_r$

by inversion on well-formedness

$\emptyset \vdash \tau[\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau}_I][\hat{\Phi} := \bar{\tau}_m] <: \tau_r[\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau}_I][\hat{\Phi} := \bar{\tau}_m]$

by Lemma C.5

$\emptyset; \bar{y} : \bar{\tau}_p[\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau}_m], x : t_S(\bar{\tau}_I) \vdash e_0[\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau}_I][\hat{\Phi} := \bar{\tau}_m] : \tau[\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau}_I][\hat{\Phi} := \bar{\tau}_m]$

by Lemma C.9

□

The proof of type preservation below relies on explicit congruence rules for the reduction semantics.

THEOREM C.12 (TYPE PRESERVATION). If $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e : \tau$ and $e \longrightarrow e'$ then $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e : \tau'$, for some τ' such that $\emptyset \vdash \tau' <: \tau$.

PROOF. By induction on the derivation of $e \longrightarrow e'$.

Case: R-FIELD

$\text{fields}(\tau_S) = \bar{f} \bar{\tau}$

by inversion on the reduction relation

$\emptyset \vdash \tau_S \text{ ok}, \emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \bar{v} : \bar{\tau}$

by inversion on typing

$\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \tau_S\{\bar{v}\}. \bar{f} : \tau_f$

by inversion on typing

$\text{fields}(\tau_S) = \bar{f} \tau_f$ and $\emptyset \vdash \bar{\tau} <: \bar{\tau}_f$

by inversion on typing

$\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash v_i : \tau_i$ with $\emptyset \vdash \tau_i <: \tau_f$

by the above

Case: R-CALL

$body_{\emptyset}(type(v).m(\bar{\tau})) = (x, \bar{y}).e$ by inversion on the reduction relation
 $v.m(\bar{\tau})(\bar{v}) \longrightarrow e[x := v][\bar{y} := \bar{v}]$ by inversion on the reduction relation
 $m(\mathbf{type} \bar{\alpha} \bar{\tau}_l) (\bar{y} \bar{\tau}_p) \tau_r \in methods_{\emptyset}(\tau)$ by inversion on typing
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash v : \tau$ by inversion on typing
 $\emptyset \vdash \bar{\tau} <: \bar{\tau}_l[\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau}]$ by inversion on typing
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \bar{v} : \bar{\tau}_a$ by inversion on typing
 $\emptyset \vdash \bar{\tau}_a <: \bar{\tau}_p[\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau}]$ by inversion on typing
 $\exists \tau' \text{ s.t. } \emptyset \vdash \tau' \text{ ok}, \emptyset \vdash \tau' <: \tau_r[\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau}_m] \text{ and } \emptyset; \bar{y} : \bar{\tau}_p[\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau}_m], x : t_S(\bar{\tau}_l) \vdash e : \tau'$ by Lemma C.11
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e[x := v][\bar{y} := \bar{v}] : \tau'', \text{ for some } \tau'' \text{ s.t. } \emptyset \vdash \tau'' <: \tau'$ by Lemma C.10
 $\emptyset \vdash \tau'' <: \tau_r[\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau}_m]$ by transitivity

Case: R-ASSERT

$v.(\tau) \longrightarrow v$ this case
 $\emptyset \vdash type(v) <: \tau$ by inversion on the reduction relation
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash v : type(v)$ by definition
 $v = \tau_S\{\bar{v}\}, \text{ for some } \tau_S \text{ and } \bar{v}$ by definition of value
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash v : \tau_S$ by inversion on typing

Case: RC-REC

$e.m(\bar{\tau})(\bar{e}) \longrightarrow e'.m(\bar{\tau})(\bar{e})$ this case
 $e \longrightarrow e'$ by inversion on the reduction relation
 $m(\mathbf{type} \bar{\alpha} \bar{\tau}_l) (\bar{y} \bar{\tau}_p) \tau_r \in methods_{\emptyset}(\tau)$ by inversion on typing
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e : \tau$ by inversion on typing
 $\emptyset \vdash \bar{\tau} <: \bar{\tau}_l[\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau}]$ by inversion on typing
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \bar{e} : \bar{\tau}_a$ by inversion on typing
 $\emptyset \vdash \bar{\tau}_a <: \bar{\tau}_p[\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau}]$ by inversion on typing
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e' : \tau', \text{ for some } \tau' \text{ such that } \emptyset \vdash \tau' <: \tau$ by i.h.
 $m(\mathbf{type} \bar{\alpha} \bar{\tau}_l) (\bar{y} \bar{\tau}_p) \tau_r \in methods_{\emptyset}(\tau')$ by Lemma C.7
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e'.m(\bar{\tau})(\bar{e}) : \tau_r[\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau}]$ by rule T-CALL

Case: RC-FIELD

$e.f \longrightarrow e'.f$ this case
 $e \longrightarrow e'$ by inversion on the reduction relation
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e : \tau_S \text{ and } f \tau \in fields(\tau_S)$ by inversion on typing
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e' : \tau \text{ with } \emptyset \vdash \tau <: \tau_S$ by i.h.
 $\tau = \tau_S$ by Lemma C.2
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e'.f : \tau$ by rule T-FIELD

Case: RC-LITERAL

$\tau_S\{\bar{v} \cdot e \cdot \bar{e}\} \longrightarrow \tau_S\{\bar{v} \cdot e' \cdot \bar{e}\}$ this case
 $e \longrightarrow e'$ by inversion on the reduction relation
 $\emptyset \vdash \tau_S \text{ ok}$ by inversion on typing
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \bar{v} \cdot e \cdot \bar{e} : \bar{\tau}$ by inversion on typing
 $fields(\tau_S) = \bar{f} \tau_f$ by inversion on typing
 $\emptyset \vdash \bar{\tau} <: \bar{\tau}_f$ by inversion on typing

$\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e' : \tau'$ with $\emptyset \vdash \tau' <: \tau$ by i.h.
 $\emptyset \vdash \tau' <: \tau_f$ by transitivity
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \tau_S\{\bar{v} \cdot e' \cdot \bar{e}\} : \tau_S$ by rule T-LITERAL

Case: RC-ASSERT

$e.(\tau) \longrightarrow e'.(\tau)$ this case
 $e \longrightarrow e'$ by inversion on the reduction relation
 $\emptyset \vdash \tau \text{ ok}$ by inversion on typing
Subcase: $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e : \tau'_I$
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e' : \tau'$ with $\emptyset \vdash \tau' <: \tau'_I$ by i.h.
Subsubcase: τ' is an interface type, $\emptyset \vdash \tau <: \tau'$ and τ is a struct type
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e'.(\tau) : \tau$ by rule T-ASSERT_S
Subsubcase: τ' is an interface type and τ is an interface type
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e'.(\tau) : \tau$ by rule T-ASSERT_I
Subsubcase: τ' is an interface type, $\emptyset \vdash \tau \not<: \tau'$ and τ is a struct type
 Impossible
Subsubcase: τ' is a struct type
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e'.(\tau) : \tau$ by rule T-STUPID
Subcase: $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e : \tau_S$
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e' : \tau'$ with $\emptyset \vdash \tau' <: \tau_S$ by i.h.
 $\tau' = \tau_S$ by Lemma C.2
 $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e'.(\tau) : \tau$ by rule T-STUPID

□

C.2 Progress

We extend the definition of e panic straightforwardly from FG to FGG.

LEMMA C.13 (FGG CANONICAL FORMS). *If e is a value and $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e : t$ then $t = \tau_S$, for some τ_S and $e = \tau_S\{\bar{v}\}$, for some \bar{v} .*

PROOF. Straightforward induction on typing. □

THEOREM C.14 (FGG PROGRESS). *If $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e : \tau$ then either e is a value, e panic or $e \longrightarrow e'$.*

PROOF. The proof follows the same lines of Theorem B.8. □

C.3 Monomorphisability

LEMMA C.15. *If $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau$ and $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e \blacktriangleright \omega$, then ω is finite.*

PROOF. By straightforward induction on the rules from Figure 20. \square

Hereafter, we let ρ range over elements of Ω and ω , i.e., ρ is of the form τ or $\tau.m(\psi)$. Also, we assume that all formal type parameters are pairwise distinct, without loss of generality.

Given $\eta_1 = (\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau})$, we write $[\eta_1 \cdot \eta_2]$ for $(\alpha := \tau[\eta_2])$. Also, we write $[\eta_1 \cdot \eta_2 \cdot \eta_3]$ for $[\eta_1 \cdot [\eta_2 \cdot \eta_3]]$. Next, we extend naturally the occurs check from Figure 23 as follows:

$$\frac{\phi = \bar{\tau} \quad \alpha_i < \tau_i}{(\text{type } \bar{\alpha} \bar{\tau}_i) < \phi} \quad \frac{\tau \neq \alpha \quad \alpha \in \text{fv}(\tau)}{\alpha < \tau} \quad \frac{\alpha_i < \tau_i}{\bar{\alpha} < \bar{\tau}}$$

We say that a substitution $(\bar{\alpha} := \bar{\tau})$ is good if $\neg(\bar{\alpha} < \bar{\tau})$.

LEMMA C.16. *Given $P = \bar{D} \triangleright d$, if P ok holds and P nomono does not hold, then for each declaration **func** $(x \ t_S(\Phi)) \ m(\Psi)N \ \{\text{return } e\} \in \bar{D}$, posing $\Delta = \Phi, \Psi$, for all n and $\rho \in G_\Delta^n(\{t_S(\hat{\Phi}), t_S(\hat{\Phi}).m(\hat{\Psi})\})$, there are $\eta_1 \cdots \eta_n$ such that $\rho = \rho_0[\eta_1 \cdots \eta_n]$, such that for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $[\eta_1 \cdots \eta_i]$ is a good substitution.*

PROOF. By induction on n . Pose $\omega = \{t_S(\hat{\Phi}), t_S(\hat{\Phi}).m(\hat{\Psi})\}$.

Let $n = 1$. If $\rho \in \omega$ then we have the result with the empty substitution. If $\rho \in G(\omega) \setminus \omega$, then it has the form $\rho_0[\eta]$ where ρ_0 occurs in the body of method $t_S(\hat{\Phi}).m(\hat{\Psi})$ with $\eta = (\Phi, \Psi := \Phi, \Psi)$, which is trivially good.

Assume the result holds for n , let us show it holds for $n + 1$. By definition of G , we have

$$G_\Delta^{n+1}(\omega) = G_\Delta^n(\omega) \cup F\text{-closure}(G_\Delta^n(\omega)) \cup M\text{-closure}_\Delta(G_\Delta^n(\omega)) \cup I\text{-closure}_\Delta(G_\Delta^n(\omega)) \cup S\text{-closure}_\Delta(G_\Delta^n(\omega))$$

By induction, we have that for all $\rho \in G_\Delta^n(\omega)$, $\rho = \rho_0[\eta_1 \cdots \eta_n]$ such that for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, substitution $[\eta_1 \cdots \eta_i]$ is good.

- If ρ is generated by *F-closure*, then we have $\rho = \rho_0[\eta \cdot \eta_1 \cdots \eta_n]$ where ρ_0 is a field of some $\tau \in G_\Delta^n(\omega)$. The fact that all $[\eta \cdot \eta_1 \cdots \eta_i]$ are good follows by induction hypothesis and the assumption that structures are not recursive.
- If ρ is generated by *M-closure*, then it is a type that occurs in the signature of some $\tau.m(\psi) \in G_\Delta^n(\omega)$, with $\tau.m(\psi) = \rho'[\eta_1 \cdots \eta_n]$ by induction hypothesis, hence we have $\rho = \rho_0[\eta_1 \cdots \eta_n]$.
- If ρ is generated by *I-closure*, then we have that τ'_I and $\tau_I.m'(\psi)$ are in $G_\Delta^n(\omega)$. By induction hypothesis, we have $\tau'_I = \rho[\eta_1 \cdots \eta_n]$ and $\tau_I.m'(\psi) = \rho_2[\eta'_1 \cdots \eta'_n]$, thus we have $\rho = \rho_3[(\eta_1, \eta'_1) \cdots (\eta_n, \eta'_n)]$. All $[(\eta_1, \eta'_1) \cdots (\eta_i, \eta'_i)]$ are good by induction hypothesis and assumptions that type parameters are pairwise distinct.
- If ρ is generated by *S-closure*, then $\rho = \rho_0(\Phi', \Psi' := \tau[\eta_1 \cdots \eta_n])$, with ρ_0 an instance occurring in the body of a method $t'_S(\Phi').m'(\Psi')$ and $\tau[\eta_1 \cdots \eta_n] \in G_\Delta^n(\omega)$.

We show that for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, each $(\Phi', \Psi' := \tau[\eta_1 \cdots \eta_i])$ is a good substitution, by contradiction. If the substitution is not good, then one of the type parameter in Φ', Ψ' must occur in $\tau[\eta_1 \cdots \eta_i]$. Since all type parameters are distinct, it means that we have visited $t'_S(\Phi').m'(\Psi')$ before. Hence all substitutions must have occurred in $G_{\Delta'}^i(\{t'_S(\hat{\Phi}'), t'_S(\hat{\Phi}').m(\hat{\Psi}')$), with $\Delta' = \Psi', \Phi'$. We know by induction ($i \leq n$) that all substitutions in this set are good, thus we have a contradiction. \square

Give $\eta = (\overline{\alpha} := \overline{\tau})$ and $\eta' = (\overline{\alpha} := \overline{\sigma})$, we write $[\eta] \succ [\eta']$, iff the number of solved variables in η' is strictly greater than the number of solved variables in η . Variable α is *solved* in $(\overline{\alpha} := \overline{\tau})$ if $\alpha \in \overline{\alpha}$ and $\alpha \notin \text{fv}(\overline{\tau})$. We say that η is solved if all its variables are solved, otherwise it is unsolved.

LEMMA C.17. *Given $P = \overline{D} \triangleright d$, if P ok holds and P nomono does not hold, then for each declaration $\mathbf{func} (x \ t_S(\Phi)) \ m(\Psi)N \ \{\mathbf{return} \ e\} \in \overline{D}$, posing $\Delta = \Phi, \Psi$, there is n (finite) such that $G_\Delta^n(\{t_S(\hat{\Phi}), t_S(\hat{\Phi}).m(\hat{\Psi})\}) = G_\Delta^{n+1}(\{t_S(\hat{\Phi}), t_S(\hat{\Phi}).m(\hat{\Psi})\})$.*

PROOF. Clearly, we have $G_\Delta^n(\{t_S(\hat{\Phi}), t_S(\hat{\Phi}).m(\hat{\Psi})\}) \subseteq G_\Delta^{n+1}(\{t_S(\hat{\Phi}), t_S(\hat{\Phi}).m(\hat{\Psi})\})$ for all $n \geq 1$.

Using Lemma C.16, we know that every element in these sets (where k is n or $n+1$) is of the form $\rho[\eta_1 \cdots \eta_k]$ such that $1 \leq i \leq k$, $[\eta_1 \cdots \eta_i]$ is good. There are finitely many instance ρ since they consists of a type name with finitely many type parameters, or a pair of type name with finitely many parameters and a method name, with finitely many type parameters. The number of distinct ρ is bounded by the number of declarations (methods and types) and the number of method signatures in interfaces.

Because each η_i is extracted from a syntactical occurrence of a method call or type instantiation, there are also finitely many substitutions η_i . The number of distinct substitutions η_i is bounded by the size of the syntax of P .

By Lemma C.16, the sequences of substitutions grow on the left. We show that there is a well-founded ordering on these sequences, when they are not permutations. Note that they are only finitely many substitutions that are permutations. First, every sequence of substitutions $[\eta_1 \cdots \eta_i \cdots \eta_n]$ with η_i solved, can be replaced by $[\eta_1 \cdots \eta_i]$.

Next, we show that for $\rho[\eta'] \in G_\Delta^n(\{t_S(\hat{\Phi}), t_S(\hat{\Phi}).m(\hat{\Psi})\})$ and $\rho[\eta \cdot \eta'] \in G_\Delta^{n+1}(\{t_S(\hat{\Phi}), t_S(\hat{\Phi}).m(\hat{\Psi})\})$, if $\rho[\eta'] \neq \rho[\eta \cdot \eta']$, then we have $[\eta'] \succ [\eta \cdot \eta']$ (assuming we have shortened the sequences with solved substitutions as above).

Clearly the number of solved variables in $[\eta \cdot \eta']$ is at least the number of solved variables in $[\eta']$, indeed each α_i occurring in $\overline{\tau}$ is replaced by σ_i . There must be α_i such that it $\text{fv}(\sigma) \cap \overline{\alpha} = \emptyset$ otherwise there would be a cycle which would lead to a bad substitution. Applying all substitutions in η' then replacing α_i will solve it in $[\eta \cdot \eta']$ hence the number of solved variable is strictly increasing.

Hence, there is well-founded ordering over the elements generated by the limit of G , hence there exists a finite fixpoint. \square

THEOREM C.18 (DECIDABILITY). *If P ok then it is decidable whether or not P nomono holds.*

PROOF. We construct a dovetailing algorithm that decides whether or not P nomono holds as follows. Given $P = \overline{D} \triangleright d$, we simultaneously check whether D_i nomono holds for all i iteratively (starting with $n = 1$). The algorithm terminates either (i) when n is found such that $G_\Delta^n(\omega \cup \{t_S(\hat{\Phi})\}) = G_\Delta^{n+1}(\omega \cup \{t_S(\hat{\Phi})\})$, i.e., a fixpoint has been found, for *each* method declaration, or (ii) when there is a method such that there is n with $(t_S(\phi).m(\psi)) \in G_\Delta^n(\omega \cup \{t_S(\hat{\Phi})\})$ s.t. $\Phi < \phi$ or $\Psi < \psi$ (i.e., the occurs check fails).

This algorithm terminates if (i) all declaration checks reach a fixpoint or (ii) if at least one declaration fails the occurs check. By Lemma C.17 we know that either (i) or (ii) will eventually be satisfied, hence the algorithm always terminates. \square

THEOREM C.19 (MONOMORPHISABILITY). *If P ok and P nomono doesn't hold then $P \blacktriangleright \Omega$ with Ω finite.*

PROOF. Direct consequence from Lemma C.17, considering the main function as a special case of a method declaration (with no type parameter). \square

D PROOF OF THEOREM 5.3

LEMMA D.1. *If $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e : \tau$, $\Delta; \Gamma \vdash e \blacktriangleright \omega$, and $\sigma.m(\phi) \in \omega$, then $\sigma \in \omega$.*

PROOF. By straightforward induction on the rules from Figure 20. \square

LEMMA D.2. *Let $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash e : \tau$, $\emptyset \vdash e \blacktriangleright \omega$ and $\Omega = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_0^n(\omega)$. Then:*

- $\tau \in \Omega$;
- If $\tau_S\{\overline{e'}\}$ is a subexpression of e then $\tau_S \in \Omega$ and $\overline{\tau} \in \Omega$, with $(\overline{f \tau}) = \text{fields}(\tau_S)$;
- If $e'.(\sigma)$ is a subexpression of e then $\sigma \in \Omega$;
- If $e'.m(\psi)(\overline{e})$ is a subexpression of e with $\emptyset \vdash e' : \sigma$ then $\{\sigma, \sigma.m(\psi)\} \subset \Omega$.

PROOF. Straightforward by the definitions for computation of instance sets and G . \square

LEMMA D.3. *Let $\Delta; x : t_S(\hat{\Phi})$, $\overline{x : \tau} \vdash e : \tau$ for some **func** $(x t_S(\Phi)) m(\Psi)(\overline{x \tau}) \sigma \{\text{return } e\} \text{ ok}$, $\Phi; \Psi \text{ ok}$ Δ and $\Delta \vdash \tau <: \sigma$. If $\Delta; x : t_S(\hat{\Phi})$, $\overline{x : \tau} \vdash e : \tau$ if $\theta = (\Delta :=_{\Delta} \phi)$, for some ϕ , $\emptyset; x : t_S(\hat{\Phi})[\theta]$, $\overline{x : \tau[\theta]} \vdash e \blacktriangleright \omega$, and $\Omega = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_0^n(\omega \cup \{t_S(\hat{\Phi})[\theta], \tau[\theta], t_S(\hat{\Phi})[\theta].m(\hat{\Phi}[\theta])\})$ then $\tau[\theta] \in \Omega$.*

PROOF. By induction definitions for computation of instance sets, G , F -closure and M -closure. \square

LEMMA D.4. *If $\emptyset; \overline{x : \sigma} \vdash e : \tau$, $\emptyset; \overline{x : \sigma} \vdash e \blacktriangleright \omega$ and $\Omega = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_0^n(\omega')$, with $\cup\{\overline{\sigma}\} \subset \omega'$ and $\omega \subset \omega'$ then $\tau \in \Omega$.*

PROOF. By induction definitions for computation of instance sets, G , F -closure and M -closure. \square

LEMMA D.5. *If $\theta \vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger$ then $\vdash \tau[\theta] \mapsto t^\dagger$. If $\theta \vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger$ then $\vdash e[\theta] \mapsto e^\dagger$.*

PROOF. Straightforward induction on the definition of monomorphisation of expressions and type names. \square

LEMMA D.6 (MONOMORPHISATION PRESERVES SUBTYPING). *Let $P \text{ ok}$, $P \blacktriangleright \Omega$, $\Delta \vdash \tau, \sigma \text{ ok}$ and $\theta = (\Delta :=_{\Delta} \phi)$, for some ϕ , $\sigma[\theta], \tau[\theta] \in \Omega$ and $\theta \vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger$. If $\Delta \vdash \tau <: \sigma$ then $t^\dagger <: u^\dagger$, with $\theta \vdash \sigma \mapsto u^\dagger$.*

PROOF. We proceed by case analysis on $\Delta \vdash \tau <: \sigma$. If the derivation holds by rule $<:_\text{PARAM}$, then $\tau = \sigma = \alpha$ and we have that $\alpha[\theta] = \tau'$, for some τ' . Since $\tau' \in \Omega$ and $\theta \vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger$ we have that $\theta \vdash \tau' \mapsto t^\dagger$ and $t^\dagger \text{ ok}$. We conclude by reflexivity of the FG implements relation.

If the derivation holds by rule $<:_S$, then $\tau = \sigma = \tau_S$. Since $\tau_S[\theta] \in \Omega$ and $\theta \vdash \tau_S \mapsto t^\dagger$ we have that $t^\dagger \text{ ok}$ and conclude by the FG implements $<:_S$ rule.

If the derivation holds by rule $<:_I$, then $\sigma = \tau_I$, for some τ_I , with $\text{methods}_\Delta(\tau) \supseteq \text{methods}_\Delta(\tau_I)$. Since $\theta \vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger$ and $\tau[\theta] \in \Omega$ then $t^\dagger \text{ ok}$. Moreover, since $\tau_I[\theta] \in \Omega$ then there exists some u^\dagger such that $\theta \vdash \tau_I \mapsto u^\dagger$ and $u^\dagger \text{ ok}$.

We now proceed by a case analysis on the set of methods $M = \{\tau_I[\theta].m(\psi) \mid \tau_I[\theta].m(\psi) \in \Omega\}$. If this set is empty, then in the monomorphisation of P (P^\dagger), the type declaration for u^\dagger contains only the methods generated by the second premise of rule M-SPEC. Since $\tau[\theta] \in \Omega$, either τ is a struct type, and then we know that all its methods have a corresponding “dummy” analogue in P^\dagger and since $\text{methods}_\Delta(\tau) \supseteq \text{methods}_\Delta(\tau_I)$ then it must be the case that $\text{methods}(t^\dagger) \supseteq \text{methods}(u^\dagger)$ and we conclude by the FG implements $<:_I$ rule. If τ is an interface type, the type declaration for t^\dagger contains at least the methods generated by the second premise of rule M-SPEC, and since $\text{methods}_\Delta(\tau) \supseteq \text{methods}_\Delta(\tau_I)$ it follows that $\text{methods}(t^\dagger) \supseteq \text{methods}(u^\dagger)$ and we conclude by the FG implements $<:_I$ rule.

If the set M is not empty, then the declaration for u^\dagger contains the dummy version of all methods of $\tau_I[\theta]$ and the monomorphisations of those in M (by rules M-TYPE, M-INTERFACE, and M-SPEC).

If τ is an interface type, since $\tau[\theta] \in \Omega$, $M \subseteq \Omega$ and $\emptyset \vdash \tau[\theta] <: \tau_I[\theta]$ by (Lemma C.5) then by *I-closure* each $\tau_I[\theta].m(\psi) \in \Omega$ has a corresponding $\tau_I[\theta]'.m(\psi) \in \Omega$ and so the type declaration for t^\dagger contains both the methods generated by the second premise of rule M-SPEC and all those corresponding to the monomorphisations of the methods of $\tau_I[\theta]$ in M , and thus $methods(t^\dagger) \supseteq methods(u^\dagger)$ and we conclude by the FG implements $<:_I$ rule. Finally, if τ is a struct type, we know that all its methods have a corresponding “dummy” analogue in P^\dagger for t^\dagger . Moreover, Since $\emptyset \vdash \tau[\theta] <: \tau_I[\theta]$ by (Lemma C.5), $\tau[\theta] \in \Omega$ and $M \subset \Omega$, by *S-closure* each $\tau_I[\theta].m(\psi) \in \Omega$ has a corresponding $\tau[\theta].m(\psi) \in \Omega$ and so, since $methods_\Delta(\tau) \supseteq methods_\Delta(\tau_I)$ we have that by rule M-FUNC, $methods(t^\dagger) \supseteq methods(u^\dagger)$ and we conclude by the FG implements $<:_I$ rule. \square

LEMMA D.7. *If P ok with $P = \overline{D} \triangleright d$ and $\vdash P \mapsto P^\dagger$ with $P^\dagger = \overline{D}^\dagger \triangleright d^\dagger$, $P \blacktriangleright \Omega$, $\emptyset \vdash \tau$ ok and $\tau \in \Omega$ then if $\vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger$ then **type** t^\dagger $T^\dagger \in \overline{D}^\dagger$, for some T^\dagger .*

PROOF. Straightforward by definition of monomorphisation. \square

LEMMA D.8 (MONOMORPHISATION PRESERVES WELL-FORMEDNESS OF TYPE DECLARATIONS). *If P ok with $P = \overline{D} \triangleright d$ and $\vdash P \mapsto P^\dagger$ with $P^\dagger = \overline{D}^\dagger \triangleright d^\dagger$ then: If **type** t^\dagger $T^\dagger \in \overline{D}^\dagger$ then **type** t^\dagger T^\dagger ok.*

PROOF. By inversion on monomorphisation we have that $P \blacktriangleright \Omega$, $\Omega \vdash \overline{D} \mapsto \overline{D}$, $\overline{D}^\dagger = \{\mathbf{type} \text{ Top } \mathbf{struct} \{\}\} \cup \bigcup \overline{D}$ and $\emptyset \vdash d \mapsto d^\dagger$.

If **type** t^\dagger $T^\dagger = \mathbf{type} \text{ Top } \mathbf{struct} \{\}$ then **type** $\text{Top } \mathbf{struct} \{\}$ ok is immediate. Otherwise, we have that **type** t^\dagger T^\dagger is such that **type** $t(\Phi) T \in D$ and there exists some $t(\phi) \in \Omega$ where $\eta; \mu \vdash T \mapsto T^\dagger$, with $\eta = (\Phi := \phi)$ and $\mu = \{m(\psi) \mid t(\phi).m(\psi) \in \Omega\}$.

If T^\dagger is of the form $\mathbf{struct}\{f \ t^\dagger\}$, by inversion we have that $\eta \vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger$. Since $t(\phi) \in \Omega$, by *F-closure* we have that $\tau[\eta] \in \Omega$. We show that can thus establish that **type** t^\dagger T^\dagger ok by showing *distinct*(\overline{f}) (since **type** $t(\Phi) T \in D$ and P ok) and by showing that t^\dagger ok (since $\tau[\eta] \in \Omega$, $\eta \vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger$ and $\Omega \vdash \overline{D} \mapsto \overline{D}$).

If T^\dagger is of the form **interface** $\{\bigcup \overline{S}\}$, we know that $T = \mathbf{interface}\{S\}$ and $\eta; \mu \vdash \overline{S} \mapsto \overline{S}$. For method signatures in $\bigcup \overline{S}$ arising from rule M-ID, well-formedness is immediate. For the rest, distinctness follows from P ok and well-formedness follows from *M-closure*, $t(\phi).m(\psi) \in \Omega$ and $\Omega \vdash \overline{D} \mapsto \overline{D}$. \square

LEMMA D.9 (MONOMORPHISATION PRESERVES TYPING OF EXPRESSIONS). *If P ok and $P \blacktriangleright \Omega$ and $\emptyset; \overline{x} : \overline{\tau} \vdash e : \sigma$ and $\emptyset; \overline{x} : \overline{\tau} \vdash e \blacktriangleright \omega$ and $\omega \subset \Omega$, $\overline{\tau} \in \Omega$ and $\vdash \overline{\tau} \mapsto \overline{\tau}^\dagger$ and $\vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger$ and $\vdash \sigma \mapsto u^\dagger$ then $\emptyset; \overline{x} : \overline{\tau}^\dagger \vdash e : u^\dagger$*

PROOF. By induction on the derivation of $\emptyset; \overline{x} : \overline{\tau} \vdash e : \sigma$ with case analysis on the last rule and a further case analysis on monomorphisation and instance generation. In the sequel we write Γ^\dagger for the FG typing context $\overline{x} : \overline{\tau}^\dagger$ and Γ for the corresponding FGG typing context.

Case: T-VAR

Since $(x : \sigma) \in \Gamma$ then $(x : u^\dagger)$ in Γ^\dagger and thus we conclude by FG rule T-VAR.

Case: T-CALL (e is $e_0.m(\psi)(\overline{e})$)

By inversion we have that: $\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash e_0 : \tau_0$, $\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash \overline{e} : \overline{\tau}'$, $(m(\Psi)(\overline{x}\overline{\sigma}) \sigma) \in methods_\emptyset(\tau_0)$ and $\eta = (\Psi :=_\emptyset \psi) \emptyset \vdash (\overline{\tau}' <: \overline{\sigma})[\eta]$. Since $\omega \subset \Omega$ and $\overline{\tau} \in \Omega$ it follows by Lemmas D.3 and D.2 that $\tau_0.m(\psi) \in \Omega$ and $\tau_0 \in \Omega$. Thus, since $(m(\Psi)(\overline{x}\overline{\sigma}) \sigma) \in methods_\emptyset(\tau_0)$ then by *M-closure* it follows that $\sigma[\eta] \in \Omega$ and $\sigma[\eta] \in \Omega$. Let $\emptyset \vdash \tau_0 \mapsto \tau_0^\dagger$, $\emptyset \vdash \overline{\tau}' \mapsto \overline{\tau}'^\dagger$, $\vdash e_0 \mapsto e_0^\dagger$ and

$\vdash \overline{e} \mapsto e^\dagger$, for some $t_0^\dagger, t^\dagger, e_0^\dagger$ and $\overline{e^\dagger}$. By i.h. we have that $\Gamma^\dagger \vdash e_0^\dagger : t_0^\dagger$ and $\Gamma^\dagger \vdash \overline{e^\dagger} : t'^\dagger$. Since $\tau_0.m(\psi) \in \Omega$ then $(m^\dagger(x u^\dagger) u^\dagger) \in \text{methods}(t_0^\dagger)$, where $\emptyset \vdash \sigma[\eta] \mapsto u^\dagger$ and $\emptyset \vdash \sigma[\eta] \mapsto u^\dagger$ and $\vdash m \mapsto m^\dagger$. From Lemma D.4 it follows that $\overline{\tau'} \in \Omega$ and so by Lemma D.6, we know that $t' <: u^\dagger$. By FG typing rule T-CALL it follows that $\Gamma^\dagger \vdash e_0^\dagger.m^\dagger(\overline{e^\dagger}) : u^\dagger$ and so we conclude this case.

Case: T-LITERAL (e is $\tau_S\{\overline{e}\}$)

Let $\vdash \tau_S \mapsto t^\dagger$. By inversion we have $\emptyset \vdash \tau_S \text{ ok}$, $\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash \overline{e} : \tau$, $(f \sigma) = \text{fields}(\tau_S)$ and $\emptyset \vdash \overline{\tau} <: \sigma$. Let $\vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger$ and $\vdash \tau \mapsto t'^\dagger$, for some e^\dagger and t'^\dagger . By i.h. it follows that $\Gamma^\dagger \vdash e^\dagger : t'^\dagger$. By Lemma D.4 we have that $\tau_S \in \Omega$, $\overline{\sigma} \in \Omega$ and $\overline{\tau} \in \Omega$. Let $\vdash \overline{\sigma} \mapsto u^\dagger$, for some u^\dagger . We have that $(f u^\dagger) = \text{fields}(t^\dagger)$ by Lemmas D.7 and D.8. By Lemma D.6 it follows that $t'^\dagger <: u^\dagger$ and so by FG typing rule T-LITERAL we conclude this case.

Case: T-FIELD (e is $e_0.f_i$)

Let $\vdash \tau_i \mapsto t_i^\dagger$. By inversion we have $\Gamma \vdash e : \tau_S$ and $(f \tau) = \text{fields}(\tau_S)$. By Lemma D.4 we have that $\tau_S \in \Omega$ and by F -closure we have that $\overline{\tau} \in \Omega$. Let $\vdash \tau_S \mapsto t_S^\dagger$, $\vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger$ and $e \mapsto e^\dagger$ for some t_S^\dagger, t^\dagger and e^\dagger . By i.h. it follows that $\Gamma^\dagger \vdash e^\dagger : t_S^\dagger$. Since $\tau_S \in \Omega$ and by Lemmas D.7 and D.8 we know that $(f t^\dagger) = \text{fields}(t_S)$ and we conclude by FG typing rule T-FIELD.

Case: T-ASSERT_I (e is $e_0.(\tau_J)$)

Let $\vdash \tau_J \mapsto t_J^\dagger$ and $e_0 \mapsto e_0^\dagger$. By inversion we have that $\emptyset \vdash \tau_J \text{ ok}$ and $\Gamma \vdash e : \sigma_J$. We know that $\tau_J \in \Omega$ and by Lemma D.4 we have that $\sigma_J \in \Omega$. Let $\vdash \sigma_J \mapsto u^\dagger$, by i.h. we have that $\Gamma^\dagger \vdash e_0^\dagger : u^\dagger$. Noting $\tau_J \in \Omega$, by Lemmas D.7 and D.8 we know $t_J^\dagger \text{ ok}$ and thus by FG typing rule T-ASSERT_I we have $\Gamma^\dagger \vdash e_0^\dagger.(t_J^\dagger) : t_J^\dagger$, which concludes this case.

Case: T-ASSERT_S (e is $e_0.(\tau_S)$)

Let $\vdash \tau_S \mapsto t_S^\dagger$ and $\vdash e_0 \mapsto e_0^\dagger$. By inversion we know that $\emptyset \vdash \tau_S \text{ ok}$, $\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash e_0 : \sigma_J$ and $\emptyset \vdash \tau_S <: \text{bounds}_0(\sigma_J)$. We know that $\tau_S \in \Omega$ and by Lemma D.4 we have that $\sigma_J \in \Omega$. Let $\vdash \sigma_J \mapsto u^\dagger$, by i.h. we have that $\Gamma^\dagger \vdash e_0^\dagger : u^\dagger$. Since $\tau_S \in \Omega$ and $\emptyset \vdash \tau_S \text{ ok}$, by Lemmas D.7 and D.8 we have that $t_S^\dagger \text{ ok}$. Since σ_J is closed, by definition $\text{bounds}_0(\sigma_J) = \sigma_J$ and so $\emptyset \vdash \tau_S <: \sigma_J$. By Lemma D.6, $t_S <: u^\dagger$ and by FG typing rule T-ASSERT_S we conclude that $\Gamma^\dagger \vdash e_0^\dagger.(t_S^\dagger) : t_S^\dagger$, which concludes this case.

Case: T-STUPID (e is $e_0.(\tau)$)

Let $\vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger$ and $\vdash e_0 \mapsto e_0^\dagger$. By inversion we have that $\emptyset \vdash \tau \text{ ok}$ and $\emptyset; \Gamma \vdash e_0 : \sigma_S$. We know that $\tau \in \Omega$ and by Lemma D.4 we have that $\sigma_S \in \Omega$. Let $\vdash \sigma_S \mapsto u^\dagger$. By i.h. it follows that $\Gamma^\dagger \vdash e_0^\dagger : u^\dagger$. Since $\emptyset \vdash \tau \text{ ok}$ and $\tau \in \Omega$ then Lemmas D.7 and D.8 give us $t^\dagger \text{ ok}$ and so by FG typing rule T-STUPID we have that $\Gamma^\dagger \vdash e_0^\dagger.(t^\dagger) : t^\dagger$, which concludes this case.

□

LEMMA D.10 (MONOMORPHISATION PRESERVES WELL-FORMEDNESS OF METHOD DECLARATIONS).
If $P \text{ ok}$ with $P = \overline{D} \triangleright d$ and $\vdash P \mapsto P^\dagger$ with $P^\dagger = \overline{D^\dagger} \triangleright d^\dagger$ then: If $\text{func}(x t_S^\dagger) m^\dagger N^\dagger \{\text{return } e^\dagger\} \in \overline{D^\dagger}$ then $\text{func}(x t_S) m^\dagger N^\dagger \{\text{return } e^\dagger\} \text{ ok}$.

PROOF. By inversion on monomorphisation we have that $P \blacktriangleright \Omega$, $\Omega \vdash \overline{D \mapsto \mathcal{D}}$, $\overline{D^\dagger} = \{\text{type Top struct}\} \cup \bigcup \overline{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\emptyset \vdash d \mapsto d^\dagger$.

Since $\text{func}(x t_S^\dagger) m^\dagger N^\dagger \{\text{return } e^\dagger\} \in \overline{D^\dagger}$ then by inversion we know that the method definition arises from the first premise of M-FUNC or the second. If the latter, then $m^\dagger N^\dagger = S^\dagger$ for some S^\dagger and $e^\dagger = \text{Top}\{\}$, with $\text{func}(x t_S(\Phi)) m(\Psi)N \{\text{return } e\} \in D$, $t_S(\phi) \in \Omega$, $\eta \vdash t_S(\Phi) \mapsto t_S^\dagger$

and $\eta \vdash m(\Psi)N \mapsto S^\dagger$, with $\eta = (\Phi := \phi)$. We thus have that $S^\dagger = m^*(\cdot)$ Top by inversion on $\eta \vdash m(\Psi)N \mapsto S^\dagger$. Since $t_S(\phi) \in \Omega$ then t_S^\dagger is declared in D^\dagger and well-formedness follows immediately.

If the former then we know that: **func** $(x \ t_S(\Phi)) \ m(\Psi)N \ \{\text{return } e\} \in D$, $t_S(\phi).m(\psi) \in \Omega$, $\theta \vdash t_S(\Phi) \mapsto t_S^\dagger$, $\theta \vdash m(\Psi) \mapsto m^\dagger$, $\theta \vdash N \mapsto N^\dagger$ and $\theta \vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger$, with $\theta = (\Phi := \phi, \Psi := \psi)$. We know that $N = (\bar{x} \ \bar{\tau}) \ \sigma$, $N^\dagger = (\bar{x} \ t^\dagger) \ u^\dagger$, for some \bar{t}^\dagger and u^\dagger , with $\theta \vdash \bar{\tau} \mapsto \bar{t}^\dagger$ and $\theta \vdash \sigma \mapsto u^\dagger$.

We must show that $t_S^\dagger \text{ ok}$, $\bar{t}^\dagger \text{ ok}$, $u^\dagger \text{ ok}$, $\text{distinct}(x, \bar{x})$ and $x : t_S^\dagger, x : \bar{t}^\dagger \vdash e^\dagger : t$ with $t <: u^\dagger$. Since $P \text{ ok}$ and **func** $(x \ t_S(\Phi)) \ m(\Psi)N \ \{\text{return } e\} \in D$ then we have that $\text{distinct}(x, \bar{x})$. Since $t_S(\phi).m(\psi) \in \Omega$ then by Lemma D.1, $t_S(\phi) \in \Omega$, and so by Lemma D.8 it follows that $t_S \text{ ok}$. Similarly, by *M-closure* we know that $\tau[\theta] \in \Omega$ and $\sigma[\theta] \in \Omega$ and thus by Lemma D.8 we have that $\bar{t}^\dagger \text{ ok}$ and $u^\dagger \text{ ok}$.

Since **func** $(x \ t_S(\Phi)) \ m(\Psi)N \ \{\text{return } e\} \in D$ we have that $\Delta; x:t_S(\hat{\Phi}), \bar{x}:\bar{\tau} \vdash e : \tau$ with $\Delta \vdash \tau <: \sigma$. By Lemma C.5 we know that $\emptyset \vdash \tau[\theta] <: \sigma[\theta]$. By Lemma C.9 we have that $\emptyset; x:t_S(\phi), \bar{x}:\tau[\theta] \vdash e[\theta] : \tau[\theta]$. Since $\theta \vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger$ then $\vdash e[\theta] \mapsto e^\dagger$. Similarly, $\theta \vdash t_S(\Phi) \mapsto t_S^\dagger$ implies that $\vdash t_S(\phi) \mapsto t_S^\dagger$; $\theta \vdash \bar{\tau} \mapsto \bar{t}^\dagger$ implies $\vdash \tau[\theta] \mapsto \bar{t}^\dagger$; and $\theta \vdash \sigma \mapsto u^\dagger$ implies $\vdash \sigma[\theta] \mapsto u^\dagger$ (Lemma D.5). By Lemma D.3 we know that $\tau[\theta] \in \Omega$. Let $\vdash \tau[\theta] \mapsto t$, for some t , then by Lemma D.9 we know that $x : t_S^\dagger, x : \bar{t}^\dagger \vdash e^\dagger : t$ and by Lemma D.6 it follows that $t <: u^\dagger$, which concludes the proof. \square

THEOREM D.11 (MONOMORPHISATION PRESERVES PROGRAM WELL-FORMEDNESS). *If $P \text{ ok}$ and $\vdash P \mapsto P^\dagger$ then $P^\dagger \text{ ok}$.*

PROOF. Since $P = \bar{D} \triangleright d$ we have that $P^\dagger = \bar{D}^\dagger \triangleright d^\dagger$, with $P \blacktriangleright \Omega$, for some Ω . Since $P \text{ ok}$ we know that $\text{distinct}(tdecls(\bar{D}))$ and $\text{distinct}(mdecls(\bar{D}))$. By Lemmas D.10 and D.8 it follows that $\bar{D}^\dagger \text{ ok}$. We note that that $\text{distinct}(tdecls(\bar{D}^\dagger))$ and $\text{distinct}(mdecls(\bar{D}^\dagger))$ follows straightforwardly from the definitions of monomorphisation for names. Since $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash d : \tau$, for some τ , then by Lemma D.9 we have that $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash d^\dagger : t$, with $\vdash \tau \mapsto t$, and so $P^\dagger \text{ ok}$. \square

E PROOFS OF THEOREM 5.4

THEOREM E.1 (MONOMORPHISATION REFLECTS SUBTYPING). *Let $P \text{ ok}$ with $P \blacktriangleright \Omega$, $\Delta \vdash \tau_1, \tau_2 \text{ ok}$, $t_1^\dagger \text{ ok}$, and $t_2^\dagger \text{ ok}$. Let $\eta = (\Delta := \Delta \ \psi)$, for some ψ , with $\tau_1[\eta] \in \Omega$ and $\tau_2[\eta] \in \Omega$. If $t_1^\dagger <: t_2^\dagger$ with $\eta \vdash \tau_1 \mapsto t_1^\dagger$ and $\eta \vdash \tau_2 \mapsto t_2^\dagger$ then $\tau_1 <: \tau_2$.*

PROOF. We proceed by cases on the derivation of $t_1^\dagger <: t_2^\dagger$. We use the term dummy methods to refer to methods whose signature is generated by rule M-ID.

If the derivation holds from rule $<_S$ then $t_1^\dagger = t_2^\dagger = t_S$ for some t_S . By definition of monomorphisation, since $\eta \vdash \tau_1 \mapsto t_S$ and $\eta \vdash \tau_2 \mapsto t_S$ we have that $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = t_S$, for some t_S , and we conclude by the FGG implements $<_S$ rule.

If the derivation holds from rule $<_I$ then we have that $t_2^\dagger = t_I$, for some t_I , and $\text{methods}(t_1^\dagger) \supseteq \text{methods}(t_I)$. By the definition of monomorphisation, we know that $\tau_2 = \tau_I$, for some τ_I . Since $\tau_1[\eta] \in \Omega$ and $\tau_2[\eta] \in \Omega$, and $\text{methods}(t_I)$ contains at least as many (potentially dummy) elements as $\text{methods}_\Delta(\tau_I)$, which are also in $\text{methods}(t_1^\dagger)$. Since $\tau_2[\eta] \in \Omega$ then rules M-TYPE, M-INTERFACE and M-SPEC are such that all dummy methods of t_I arise from all methods of τ_2 . If τ_1 is an interface type, by a similar reasoning we have that all dummy methods of t_1 , which contain all those of t_2 , arise from methods of τ_1 , and thus $\text{methods}_\Delta(\tau_1) \supseteq \text{methods}_\Delta(\tau_2)$, and so $\Delta \vdash \tau_1 <: \tau_2$, by FGG implements rule $<_I$. If τ_1 is a struct type, then by rule M-FUNC, since $\tau_1[\eta] \in \Omega$, we know that all dummy method implementations of t_1 (which include all methods declared for t_2) map from all

the method declarations of τ_1 and so $methods_{\Delta}(\tau_1) \supseteq methods_{\Delta}(\tau_2)$, and so $\Delta \vdash \tau_1 <: \tau_2$, by FGG implements rule $<:_I$. \square

Note: In this section, we often omit \emptyset , e.g., we write $\tau <: \tau'$ for $\emptyset \vdash \tau <: \tau'$.

LEMMA E.2. Suppose $\eta \vdash m(\psi) \mapsto m^\dagger$, $body(\tau.m(\psi)) = (x, \overline{x}).e$, $m^\dagger = \langle m(\psi[\eta]) \rangle$, $\eta \vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger$, and $\eta \vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger$ with $t^\dagger = \langle \tau[\eta] \rangle$. Then we have $body(t^\dagger.m^\dagger) = (x, \overline{x}).e^\dagger$

PROOF. Straightforward by induction on the derivations of the monomorphisation definition. \square

LEMMA E.3 (COMPOSITIONALITY). Suppose $\emptyset; \overline{x} : \overline{\tau} \vdash e : \tau$, $\emptyset; \emptyset \vdash \overline{v} : \overline{\tau'}$ and $\overline{\tau'} <: \overline{\tau}$.

Assume $\eta \vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger$ and $\eta \vdash \overline{v} \mapsto \overline{v}^\dagger$. Then we have $\eta \vdash e[\overline{x} := \overline{v}] \mapsto e^\dagger[\overline{x} := \overline{v}^\dagger]$.

PROOF. Mechanical by investigating the type derivation of $\emptyset; \overline{x} : \overline{\tau} \vdash e : \tau$ with Theorem 5.3 and Lemma D.6. \square

LEMMA E.4. Suppose $P = \overline{D} \triangleright d$, such that P ok and $\vdash P \mapsto \overline{D}^\dagger \triangleright d^\dagger$ and $d^\dagger = (x : t_S, \overline{x} : \overline{t}).e^\dagger$. Assume $\eta \vdash m(\psi) \mapsto m^\dagger$, $m^\dagger = \langle m(\psi[\eta]) \rangle$, $\eta \vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger$, $\eta \vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger$, with $\eta \vdash \tau_S \mapsto t_S^\dagger$ and $\eta \vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger$. Then $body(t^\dagger.m^\dagger) = (x : t_S^\dagger, \overline{x} : \overline{t}^\dagger).e^\dagger$ implies $body(\tau.m(\psi)) = (x : \tau_S, \overline{x} : \overline{\tau}).e$

PROOF. By investigating the derivation of $body$ in Figure 12,

$$body(t^\dagger.m^\dagger) = (x : t_S^\dagger, \overline{x} : \overline{t}^\dagger).e^\dagger$$

is derived from

$$\mathbf{func} (x : t_S^\dagger) m^\dagger (\overline{x} : \overline{t}^\dagger) t^\dagger \{\mathbf{return} e^\dagger\} \in \overline{D}^\dagger$$

Then by investigating the derivations of [T-FUNC], we have:

$$x : t_S^\dagger, \overline{x} : \overline{t}^\dagger \vdash e : u^\dagger \quad \text{and} \quad u^\dagger <: t^\dagger$$

By applying Theorem E.1, we have

$$\emptyset \vdash \tau_3 <: \tau$$

with $\eta \vdash \tau_3 \mapsto u^\dagger$. Applying the inductive hypothesis, we have

$$\mathbf{func} (x : \tau_S) m(\psi)(\overline{x} : \overline{\tau}) \tau \{\mathbf{return} e\} \in \overline{D}$$

Then applying the $body$ rule in Figure 16, we have

$$body(\tau.m(\psi)) = (x : \tau_S, \overline{x} : \overline{\tau}).e$$

as required. \square

THEOREM E.5 (MONOMORPHISATION PRESERVES AND REFLECTS REDUCTIONS). Assume $P = \overline{D} \triangleright d$, such that P ok and $\vdash P \mapsto \overline{D}^\dagger \triangleright d^\dagger$.

Then: (a) if $d \longrightarrow e$ then there exists e^\dagger such that $d^\dagger \longrightarrow e^\dagger$ and $\emptyset \vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger$; (b) if $d^\dagger \longrightarrow e'$ then there exists e such that $d \longrightarrow e$, $\emptyset \vdash e \mapsto e^\dagger$ and $e' = e^\dagger$.

PROOF. **Proof of (a):** By induction on the derivation of $d \longrightarrow e$ with a case analysis on the last reduction rule used.

Case [R-FIELD] $d = \tau_S\{\overline{v}\}.f_i \quad (\overline{f \tau}) = \text{fields}(\tau_S) \quad e = v_i$

Then by rule [M-SELECT] and [M-VALUE], $\eta \vdash \tau_S\{\overline{v}\}.f_i \mapsto t_S^\dagger\{\overline{v^\dagger}\}.f_i$ with $\eta \vdash \tau_S \mapsto t_S^\dagger$ and $\eta \vdash \overline{v} \mapsto \overline{v^\dagger}$. On the other hand, by Lemmas D.7 and D.8, we have that $(\overline{f \tau^\dagger}) = \text{fields}(t_S^\dagger)$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} d^\dagger &= t_S^\dagger\{\overline{v^\dagger}\}.f_i \\ e^\dagger &= v_i^\dagger \end{aligned}$$

Then by applying [R-FIELD], we have $d^\dagger \longrightarrow e^\dagger$, as required.

Case [R-CALL] $d = v.m(\psi)(\overline{v}) \quad (x : \tau_S, \overline{x : \tau}).e_0 = \text{body}(\text{type}(v).m(\psi)) \quad e = e_0[x := v, \overline{x := \overline{v}}]$

Then by [M-VALUE], we have $\eta \vdash v \mapsto v^\dagger$ and $\eta \vdash \overline{v} \mapsto \overline{v^\dagger}$, and by [M-CALL] and [M-METHOD], we have $\eta \vdash m(\psi) \mapsto \overline{m^\dagger}$ with $m^\dagger = \langle m(\psi[\eta]) \rangle$. By Lemma E.2, we have that $\text{body}(\text{type}(v^\dagger).m^\dagger) = (x : t_S^\dagger, \overline{x : t^\dagger}).e_0^\dagger$ with $\eta \vdash \tau_S \mapsto t_S^\dagger$ and $\eta \vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger$. Thus, by Lemma E.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d^\dagger &= v^\dagger.m^\dagger(\overline{v^\dagger}) \\ e^\dagger &= e_0^\dagger[x := v^\dagger, \overline{x := \overline{v^\dagger}}] \end{aligned}$$

Applying [R-CALL], we have: $v^\dagger.m^\dagger(\overline{v^\dagger}) \longrightarrow e_0^\dagger[x := v^\dagger, \overline{x := \overline{v^\dagger}}]$. Hence we have $d^\dagger \longrightarrow e^\dagger$.

Case [R-ASSERT] $d = v.(\tau) \quad e = v \quad \text{type}(v) <: \tau$

Then by [M-ASSERT], we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta \vdash v &\mapsto v^\dagger \\ \eta \vdash \tau &\mapsto t^\dagger \\ \eta \vdash v.(\tau) &\mapsto v^\dagger.(t^\dagger) \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma D.9 and Lemma D.6, we have that $\text{type}(v^\dagger) <: t^\dagger$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} d^\dagger &= v^\dagger.(t^\dagger) \\ e^\dagger &= v^\dagger \end{aligned}$$

Applying [R-ASSERT], we have $v^\dagger.(t^\dagger) \longrightarrow v^\dagger$. Hence we have $d^\dagger \longrightarrow e^\dagger$, as required.

Case [R-CONTEXT] $d = E[e_1] \quad e = E[e_2] \quad e_1 \longrightarrow e_2$

where E is an evaluation context. Then by the inductive hypothesis, we have $e_1^\dagger \longrightarrow e_2^\dagger$. Hence there exists

$$\begin{aligned} d^\dagger &= E_0[e_1^\dagger] \\ e_1^\dagger &\longrightarrow e_2^\dagger \\ e^\dagger &= E_0[e_2^\dagger] \end{aligned}$$

Thus we must prove

$$E_0[e_1^\dagger] = E[e_1]^\dagger \text{ and } E_0[e_2^\dagger] = E[e_2]^\dagger \quad (\star)$$

From (\star) , by applying [R-CONTEXT], we have

$$\begin{aligned} d^\dagger &= E[e_1]^\dagger \\ d^\dagger &\longrightarrow e^\dagger \\ e^\dagger &= E[e_2]^\dagger \end{aligned}$$

There are five subcases for proving (\star) :

Subcase [RC-STRUCTURE] $E[e_1] = \tau_S\{\bar{v}, e_1, \bar{e}\} \quad e_1 \longrightarrow e_2 \quad E[e_2] = \tau_S\{\bar{v}, e_2, \bar{e}\}$

Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} E[e_1]^\dagger &= t_S^\dagger\{\bar{v}^\dagger, e_1^\dagger, \bar{e}^\dagger\} \text{ with } \eta \vdash \tau_S \mapsto t_S^\dagger \\ e_1^\dagger &\longrightarrow e_2^\dagger \\ E[e_2]^\dagger &= t_S^\dagger\{\bar{v}^\dagger, e_2^\dagger, \bar{e}^\dagger\} \end{aligned}$$

Hence by letting $E_0[\] = t_S^\dagger\{\bar{v}^\dagger, e_2^\dagger, \bar{e}^\dagger\}$, we have proved (\star) , as required.

Subcase [RC-SELECT] $E[e_1] = e_1.f \quad e_1 \longrightarrow e_2 \quad E[e_2] = e_2.f$

Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} E[e_1]^\dagger &= e_1^\dagger.f \\ e_1^\dagger &\longrightarrow e_2^\dagger \\ E[e_2]^\dagger &= e_2^\dagger.f \end{aligned}$$

Hence by letting $E_0[\] = [\].f$, we have proved (\star) , as required.

Subcase [RC-RECEIVE] $E[e_1] = e_1.m(\psi)(\bar{e}) \quad e_1 \longrightarrow e_2 \quad E[e_2] = e_2.m(\psi)(\bar{e})$

Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} E[e_1]^\dagger &= e_1^\dagger.m^\dagger(\bar{e}^\dagger) \\ e_1^\dagger &\longrightarrow e_2^\dagger \\ E[e_2]^\dagger &= e_2^\dagger.m^\dagger(\bar{e}^\dagger) \end{aligned}$$

Hence by letting $E_0[\] = [\].m^\dagger(\bar{e}^\dagger)$, we have proved (\star) , as required.

Subcase [RC-ARGUMENT] $E[e_1] = v.m(\psi)(\bar{v}, e_1, \bar{e}) \quad e_1 \longrightarrow e_2 \quad E[e_1] = v.m(\psi)(\bar{v}, e_2, \bar{e})$

Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} E[e_1]^\dagger &= v^\dagger.m^\dagger(\bar{v}^\dagger, e_1^\dagger, \bar{e}^\dagger) \\ e_1^\dagger &\longrightarrow e_2^\dagger \\ E[e_2]^\dagger &= v^\dagger.m^\dagger(\bar{v}^\dagger, e_2^\dagger, \bar{e}^\dagger) \end{aligned}$$

Hence by letting $E_0[\] = v^\dagger.m^\dagger(\overline{v^\dagger}, [\], \overline{e^\dagger})$, we have proved (\star) , as required.

Subcase [RC-ASSERT] $E[e_1] = e_1(\tau) \quad e_1 \longrightarrow e_2 \quad E[e_2] = e_2(\tau)$

Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} E[e_1]^\dagger &= e_1^\dagger(t^\dagger) \text{ with } \eta \vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger \\ e_1^\dagger &\longrightarrow e_2^\dagger \\ E[e_2]^\dagger &= e_2^\dagger(t^\dagger) \end{aligned}$$

Hence by letting $E_0[\] = [\](t^\dagger)$ with $\eta \vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger$, so that we have proved (\star) , as required.

Proof of (b): By induction on the derivation of $d^\dagger \longrightarrow e^\dagger$ with a case analysis on the last reduction rule used and inspecting the last typing rule applied for d^\dagger .

Case [R-FIELD] $d^\dagger = t_S^\dagger\{\overline{v^\dagger}\}.f_i \quad (\overline{f\ \tau}) = \text{fields}(t_S^\dagger) \quad d^\dagger \longrightarrow e'$

Then we have $e' = v_i^\dagger$ by [R-FIELD]. On the other hand, by inspecting the derivations from [M-VALUE] and [M-SELECT], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \eta \vdash v &\mapsto v^\dagger \\ \eta \vdash \tau_S &\mapsto t_S^\dagger \\ \eta \vdash v &\mapsto v^\dagger \\ \eta \vdash \tau_S\{\overline{v}\}.f_i &\mapsto t_S^\dagger\{\overline{v^\dagger}\}.f_i \end{aligned}$$

By inspecting the derivation of $t_S^\dagger\{\overline{v^\dagger}\}.f_i$ by [T-FIELD], we have $(\overline{f\ \tau}) = \text{fields}(\tau_S)$. Applying [R-FIELD], we have $\tau_S\{\overline{v}\}.f_i \longrightarrow v_i$, as required.

Case [R-CALL] $d^\dagger = v^\dagger.m^\dagger(\overline{v^\dagger}) \quad d^\dagger \longrightarrow e'$

By inspecting [R-CALL], we have

$$\begin{aligned} v^\dagger.m^\dagger(\overline{v^\dagger}) &\longrightarrow e_0^\dagger[x := v^\dagger, \overline{x := v^\dagger}] \\ e' &= e_0^\dagger[x := v^\dagger, \overline{x := v^\dagger}] \\ (x : t_S^\dagger, x : t^\dagger).e_0^\dagger &= \text{body}(\text{type}(v).m^\dagger) \end{aligned}$$

By inspecting the derivation of $v^\dagger.m^\dagger(\overline{v^\dagger})$ and [M-CALL], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \eta \vdash v &\mapsto v^\dagger \\ \eta \vdash m(\psi) &\mapsto m^\dagger \\ \eta \vdash v.m(\psi)(\overline{v}) &\mapsto v^\dagger.m^\dagger(\overline{v^\dagger}) \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma E.4, we have $\text{body}(\tau.m(\psi)) = (x : \tau_S.\overline{x : \tau}).e_0$ with $\eta \vdash e_0 \mapsto e_0^\dagger$, $\eta \vdash \tau_S \mapsto t_S^\dagger$, and $\eta \vdash \tau \mapsto t^\dagger$. Applying [R-CALL], we have $v.m(\psi)(\overline{v}) \longrightarrow e_0[x := v, \overline{x := \overline{v}}]$. Then by Lemma E.3, $\eta \vdash e_0[x := v, \overline{x := \overline{v}}] \mapsto e_0^\dagger[x := v^\dagger, \overline{x := \overline{v^\dagger}}]$. Hence $d \longrightarrow e$ as required.

Case [R-ASSERT] $d^\dagger = v^\dagger.(t^\dagger) \quad d^\dagger \longrightarrow e' \quad \text{type}(v^\dagger) <: t^\dagger$

Then we have $e' = v^\dagger$. Then by inspecting the derivation of $v^\dagger.(t^\dagger)$ by [M-ASSERT], we have

$$\begin{aligned}\eta \vdash v &\mapsto v^\dagger \\ \eta \vdash \tau &\mapsto t^\dagger \\ \eta \vdash v.(\tau) &\mapsto v^\dagger.(t^\dagger)\end{aligned}$$

Then applying Lemma D.9, we have that $\eta \vdash \text{type}(v) \mapsto \text{type}(v^\dagger)$. Then by Theorem E.1, we have $\text{type}(v) <: t$. Applying [R-ASSERT], we have $v.(t) \longrightarrow v$, as desired.

Case [R-CONTEXT] $d^\dagger = E[e_1]^\dagger \quad E[e_1]^\dagger = E_0[e_1^\dagger] \quad d^\dagger \longrightarrow e'$

By investigating the derivation from [R-CONTEXT], we have

$$\begin{aligned}e_1^\dagger &\longrightarrow e'_2 \\ e' &= E_0[e'_2]\end{aligned}$$

We have to prove:

$$E_0[e'_2] = E_0[e_2^\dagger] = E[e_2]^\dagger \text{ such that } e_1 \longrightarrow e_2 \quad (\star)$$

From (\star) , we have $E[e_1] \longrightarrow E[e_2]$ by [R-CONTEXT].

There are five subcases for proving (\star) .

Subcase [RC-STRUCTURE] $E[e_1]^\dagger = t_S^\dagger\{\bar{v}^\dagger, e_1^\dagger, \bar{e}^\dagger\} \quad E[e_1]^\dagger = E_0[e_1^\dagger] \quad E_0[e_1^\dagger] \longrightarrow e'$

with $\eta \vdash \bar{v} \mapsto \bar{v}^\dagger$, $\eta \vdash \bar{e} \mapsto \bar{e}^\dagger$, and $\eta \vdash \tau_S \mapsto t_S^\dagger$. Then by inductive hypothesis on e_1^\dagger , we have $e_1^\dagger \longrightarrow e'_2 = e_2^\dagger$. Hence $e' = t_S^\dagger\{\bar{v}^\dagger, e_2^\dagger, \bar{e}^\dagger\} = E_0[e_2^\dagger] = E[e_2]^\dagger$ and $e_1 \longrightarrow e_2$, as required.

Subcase [RC-SELECT] $E[e_1]^\dagger = e_1^\dagger.f \quad E[e_1]^\dagger = E_0[e_1^\dagger] \quad e_1^\dagger \longrightarrow e'_2$

Then by inductive hypothesis on e_1^\dagger , we have $e_1^\dagger \longrightarrow e'_2 = e_2^\dagger$. Hence $e' = e_2^\dagger.f = E_0[e_2^\dagger] = E[e_2]^\dagger$ and $e_1 \longrightarrow e_2$, as required.

Subcase [RC-RECEIVE] $E[e_1]^\dagger = e_1^\dagger.m^\dagger(\bar{e}^\dagger) \quad E[e_1]^\dagger = E_0[e_1^\dagger] \quad e_1^\dagger \longrightarrow e'_2$

with $\eta \vdash m(\psi) \mapsto m^\dagger$, $\eta \vdash e_1 \mapsto e_1^\dagger$ and $\eta \vdash \bar{e} \mapsto \bar{e}^\dagger$. Then by inductive hypothesis on e_1^\dagger , we have $e_1^\dagger \longrightarrow e'_2 = e_2^\dagger$. Then we have $E[e_1]^\dagger = E_0[e_1^\dagger] = e_1^\dagger.m^\dagger(\bar{e}^\dagger) \longrightarrow e_2^\dagger.m^\dagger(\bar{e}^\dagger) = E_0[e_2^\dagger] = E[e_2]^\dagger$ with $e_1 \longrightarrow e_2$, as required.

Subcase [RC-ARGUMENT] $E[e_1]^\dagger = v^\dagger.m^\dagger(\bar{v}^\dagger, e_1^\dagger, \bar{e}^\dagger) \quad E[e_1]^\dagger = E_0[e_1^\dagger] \quad e_1^\dagger \longrightarrow e'_2$

with $\eta \vdash m(\psi) \mapsto m^\dagger$, $\eta \vdash e_1 \mapsto e_1^\dagger$ and $\eta \vdash \bar{e} \mapsto \bar{e}^\dagger$. Then by inductive hypothesis on e_1 , we have $e_1^\dagger \longrightarrow e'_2$ with $e'_2 = e_2^\dagger$. Then we have $E[e_1]^\dagger = v^\dagger.m^\dagger(\bar{v}^\dagger, e_1^\dagger, \bar{e}^\dagger) \longrightarrow v^\dagger.m^\dagger(\bar{v}^\dagger, e_2^\dagger, \bar{e}^\dagger) = E_0[e_2^\dagger] = E[e_2]^\dagger$ with $e_1 \longrightarrow e_2$, as required.

Subcase [RC-ASSERT] $E[e_1]^\dagger = e_1^\dagger(t^\dagger) \quad E_0[e_1^\dagger] = e_1^\dagger(t^\dagger) \quad e_1 \longrightarrow e'_2$

Then by inductive hypothesis on e_1 , we have $e_1^\dagger \longrightarrow e'_2$ with $e'_2 = e_2^\dagger$. Hence we have $E[e_1]^\dagger = e_1^\dagger(t^\dagger) \longrightarrow e_2^\dagger(t^\dagger) = E_0[e_2^\dagger] = E[e_2]^\dagger$ with $e_1 \longrightarrow e_2$, as required.

□