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Abstract

Reynolds' relational parametricity provides a powerful way to reason about programs in terms of invariance under changes of data representation. A dazzling array of applications of Reynolds' theory exists, exploiting invariance to yield "free theorems", non-inhabitation results, and encodings of algebraic datatypes. Outside computer science, invariance is a common theme running through many areas of mathematics and physics. For example, the area of a triangle is unaltered by rotation or flipping. If we scale a triangle, then we scale its area, maintaining an invariant relationship between the two. The transformations under which properties are invariant are often organised into groups, with the algebraic structure reflecting the composability and invertibility of transformations.

In this paper, we investigate programming languages whose types are indexed by algebraic structures such as groups of geometric transformations. Other examples include types indexed by principals—for information flow security—and types indexed by distances—for analysis of analytic uniform continuity properties. Following Reynolds, we prove a general Abstraction Theorem that covers all these instances. Consequences of our Abstraction Theorem include free theorems expressing invariance properties of programs, type isomorphisms based on invariance properties, and non-definability results indicating when certain algebraically indexed types are uninhabited or only inhabited by trivial programs. We have fully formalised our framework and most examples in Coq.

Categories and Subject Descriptors D.1.1 [Programming techniques]: Applicative (functional) programming; D.2.4 [Software Engineering]: Software/Program Verification; D.3.3 [Programming Languages]: Language Constructs and Features—Data types and structures

General Terms Languages, Theory, Types

Keywords parametricity, units of measure, dimensional analysis, invariance, computational geometry, information flow, metric types, uniform continuity

1. Introduction

The best way we know of describing the semantics of parametric polymorphism is relational parametricity, whose central result is Reynolds' Abstraction Theorem [18]. Its striking consequences include the well-known "free theorems" for polymorphic types [22]. non-inhabitation results, and precise correspondences between System F encodings and algebraic datatypes [16], abstract data types, and, most recently, higher-order encodings of binder syntax [2].

Relational parametricity is in essence a principle of invariance: the behaviour of polymorphic code is invariant under changes of data representation. For example, the type ∀α. list(α) → list(α) tells us that any transformation applied to elements of the input list will be reflected by the same transformation applied to elements of the result. Invariance results also abound in mathematics and physics. The area of a triangle is invariant with respect to isometries of the Euclidean plane; the determinant of a matrix is invariant under changes of basis; and Newton's laws are the same in all inertial frames. Typically, the transformations under which invariants are preserved have interesting structure: for example, translations in the Euclidean plane form an abelian group.

Inspired by this connection, we study type systems that capture rich invariants in types indexed by attributes with algebraic structure. For example, in computational geometry, points in the plane can be indexed by attributes representing affine transformations; in information-flow security, computations can be indexed by principals; in differential privacy, types can be indexed by ‘distance’. Types that are polymorphic over such indices induce invariance properties and abstraction barriers beyond those introduced by their unindexed versions, as we shall illustrate. This generalises previous work by the third author on types parameterized by units of measure, whose invariance properties relate to changes of units, or scaling [13].

Invariance To illustrate type-induced invariance properties, consider two-dimensional geometry. In a conventional type system, a function areaTri that computes the area of a triangle might be assigned the type: vec × vec × vec → real. But in our proposed system we can assign it the following more expressive polymorphic type:

areaTri : ∀t : T. vec(t) × vec(t) × vec(t) → real

This type expresses the fact that if each of the arguments to areaTri is translated by the same vector, then the result remains the same, that is, it is invariant under translation. Formally, for any vector t, areaTri(t + v1, t + v2, t + v3) = areaTri(v1, v2, v3)

Transformations typically compose in various ways, and the compositions satisfy algebraic laws. For example, we can assign a function that computes the area of a circle given its radius the following polymorphic type:

areaCircle : ∀s : GL. real(s) → real(s · s)

This captures the fact that the area of a circle varies as the square of its radius, i.e., areaCircle(kr) = k² · areaCircle(r) for any k ≠ 0 (the ‘sorts’ T and GL will be explained later). Here, s can be interpreted as the units of measure of the argument to areaCircle, and ‘·’ composes units using the product. We can also add an
inverse operation and identity unit of measure 1, and then impose the algebraic laws of abelian groups. This permits identification of, for example, \( \text{real}(s \cdot s^{-1}) \) with the type \( \text{real}(1) \) of dimensionless constants.

**Abstraction** In his original paper on parametricity, Reynolds asserted that type structure is a syntactic discipline for enforcing levels of abstraction. We see something analogous here: if all primitive operations are given types that reflect their behaviour under translation, then there is no way to ‘break’ this property. For example, there is no way that \( \text{areaTri} \) can depend on the actual coordinates of its inputs. Furthermore, the distinction between points and vectors that is often enforced through abstract data types [7] is captured here by indices instead. For example, the operation that takes two points and computes their vector difference can be assigned the type \( \forall t : T_2. \text{vec}(t) \times \text{vec}(t) \rightarrow \text{vec}(0) \), reflecting the invariance of the result (a pure vector) under translations of the point arguments. As a result through types alone we can, in essence, derive so-called coordinate-free geometry [15].

The invariance properties discussed above can be seen as “free theorems” [22], but the abstraction afforded by polymorphic indexed types can also induce interesting type isomorphisms. The type of \( \text{areaCircle} \) above is in fact isomorphic to \( \text{real}(1) \). A moment’s thought reveals why: what possible unary functions can be constructed whose outputs scale as the square of the scaling of their inputs? Answer: just those functions of the form \( \lambda x. k x^2 \) for some constant \( k \). In this case, of course, we expect that \( k = \pi \).

**Relational parametricity** To derive such invariance and abstraction properties of types, we adopt the techniques of relational parametricity. We follow the mantra semantics first, syntax later in studying types with algebraic structure. We have not yet built a practical programming language that supports algebraically indexed types; nor have we designed type checking, type inference, or static analysis algorithms. But when we do so, the semantics will guide us. The fact that zero is polymorphic in units of measure (it can be given type \( \forall u. \text{real}(u) \)) whereas other constants are dimensionless (having type \( \text{real}(1) \)) is justified by the invariance properties induced by the types: zero is invariant under scaling, other constants are not. For less trivial constants and operations, the appropriate types are not so apparent, as we shall see, but invariance properties expressed by the semantics guide us in assigning appropriate types. Semantics does not lie!

**1.1 Contributions**

This paper makes the following specific contributions:

- We present a collection of compelling examples of algebraically indexed types, including a novel type system for geometry, a refined type system for information flow based on logic, and a simple type system with distance-indexed types.
- We formulate a type system that can either be used as a programming language in its own right, or as the target of type-based analyses. The type system consists of the usual type constructors together with a collection of indexed primitive types, universal and existential quantification over the indices, and a multi-sorted equational theory for indices.
- We describe a relational semantics for the type system and prove an analogue of Reynolds’ Abstraction Theorem, for a given model of index sorts and relational interpretation of primitive types. We prove that the semantics soundly approximates contextual equivalence.
- For each of our main examples we deduce free theorems that are consequences of our Abstraction Theorem, prove specific non-definability results, and derive interesting type isomorphisms. For a large class of first-order types we give a general method for constructing suitable models to prove non-definability results. Figure 1 illustrates the central position of our analogue of Reynolds’ Abstraction Theorem (Theorem 1) in these results.

We improve on the earlier semantics of units of measure [13] in a number of ways. By extending the language of units with an ‘absolute value’ operation, we can give more precise types and obtain more general invariance properties. The relational interpretation for units is both simpler and more flexible, and we derive slicker proofs of non-definability, and new results. Our notion of type isomorphism is stronger than before, being based on contextual equivalence.
We have fully formalised our framework and most examples in Coq, using strongly-typed term representations throughout [3]. The formalisation is available from https://github.com/bobatkey/algebraically-indexed-types

1.2 Structure of paper

Our paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we present an extended case study of two-dimensional geometry, with semi-formal description of types and results. In Section 3 we describe fully formally a general framework for algebraically-indexed types, and prove the Abstraction Theorem and soundness for semantic equivalence. Section 4 presents a number of applications of the theory to 2-d geometry, including free theorems, type isomorphisms and non-definability. Section 5 develops a more general technique for proving non-definability results. Section 6 presents the application of algebraically indexed types to information flow security, and Section 7 applies it to types indexed by distances. Finally, Section 8 discusses related work and future plans.

2. Geometry via Algebraically Indexed Types

We motivate our investigation of algebraically indexed types and their relational interpretations by developing a novel type system for programs that manipulate two-dimensional geometric data. Geometry is rich with operations that are invariant under transformation: affine operations are invariant under change of origin (Section 2.3), vector space operations are invariant under change of basis, and dot product is invariant under orthogonal changes of basis (Section 2.4). On the other hand, some geometric operations are interestingly variant under transformation. For example, cross products vary with scalings of the plane (Section 2.5). We incorporate (in)variance information about geometric primitives into type systems via algebraically indexed types.

2.1 Origin Invariance and Representation Independence

The basic data structure used in programs that manipulate geometric data is the n-tuple of numbers. In the 2-dimensional case, tuples \( \vec{v} = (x, y) \) serve double duty, representing both points—offsets from some origin—and vectors—offsets in their own right. Despite their common representation, points and vectors are very different, and distinguishing between them is the key feature of affine geometry (see, for example, Chapter 2 of Gallier’s book [9]). Nevertheless, most computer geometry libraries traditionally either leave it to the programmer to maintain the distinction between points and vectors, or else use different abstract types for points and vectors to enforce it. In this paper we investigate a more sophisticated approach based on types indexed by change of origin transformations.

This approach regards the difference between points and vectors as a change of data representation. For example, if \((0,0)\) and \((10,20)\) are two origins, then the tuple \((1,1)\) with respect to \((0,0)\) and the tuple \((11,21)\) with respect to \((10,20)\) represent the same point because they have the same displacement from these two origins, respectively. This suggests that programs that manipulate points should be invariant with respect to changes of origin. Programs that manipulate vectors, on the other hand, should not be invariant under change of origin. Different vectors represent different offsets, and the vector \((0,0)\) always represents the zero offset.

Invariance under change of representation immediately recalls Reynolds’ fable about two professors teaching the theory of complex numbers [18]. One professor represents complex numbers using rectangular coordinates \((x+i y)\), while the other represents them using polar coordinates \((r\cos \theta + i r \sin \theta)\). Happily, after learning the basic operations on complex numbers in the two representations, the two classes can interact because the theory of complex numbers is invariant under the choice of representation. Reynolds formalises the idea of invariance under changes of representation as preservation of relations. For example, if a binary relation \(R\) relates the rectangular and polar representations of complex numbers, then a program that manipulates complex numbers at a level of abstraction above their specific representation should preserve \(R\).

Reynolds’ relational approach can be applied in the geometric setting to show how quantifying over all changes of origin ensures the invariance of programs under any particular choice of origin. For this, we first define a family of binary relations on \(\mathbb{R}^2\) that is indexed by changes of origin. Changes of origin are represented by vectors in \(\mathbb{R}^2\), and form a group \(T_2\) of translations under addition. The \(T_2\)-indexed family of binary relations \(\{R_t \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2\}_{t \in T_2}\) is then defined by \(R_t = \{(\vec{v}, \vec{v}') \mid \vec{v}' = \vec{v} + \vec{t}\}\). We then consider a function \(f\) that takes as input two tuples in \(\mathbb{R}^2\) and returns a single tuple in \(\mathbb{R}^2\). We intend that the tuples all represent points with respect to the same origin, and that \(f\) is invariant under the choice of origin. Reynolds’ relational approach formalises this intention precisely. For any \(t \in T_2\):

\[
\forall (\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2) \in R_t, (\vec{v}'_1, \vec{v}'_2) \in R_t; (f(\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2), f(\vec{v}'_1, \vec{v}'_2)) \in R_t \tag{1}
\]

Unfolding the definition of \(R_t\) gives the equivalent formulation, again for all \(t \in T_2\):

\[
\forall \vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2, \vec{v}'_1, \vec{v}'_2; f(\vec{v}_1 + \vec{t}, \vec{v}_2 + \vec{t}) = f(\vec{v}'_1, \vec{v}'_2) + \vec{t} \tag{2}
\]

Thus, Reynolds’ preservation of relations, when instantiated with the family of relations \(\{R_t\}\), yields exactly the geometric property of invariance under change of origin.

2.2 A Type System for Change of Origin Invariance

Reynolds also showed how a type discipline can be used to establish that the (denotational interpretations of) programs preserve relations. For Reynolds, the type discipline of interest was that of the polymorphic \(\lambda\)-calculus, which supports the construction of new types by universal quantification over types. In terms of relations, Reynolds interprets universal quantification over types as quantification over binary relations between denotations of types. By contrast, in our statements of geometric invariance in Section 2.1 we did not quantify over all relations, but instead quantified over all changes of origin and used a specific choice of origin to select a relation from the family \(\{R_t\}\). This suggests introducing quantification over changes of origin into the language of types. We use the notation \(\forall R_t T_2.A\) for quantification over all \(2\)-dimensional translations (i.e., choices of origin) \(t\) and refer to \(T_2\) as the sort of \(t\). Note the difference in fonts used to distinguish the semantic group \(T_2\) from the syntactic sort \(T_2\). We use a similar convention below, too.

Since the sort \(T_2\) represents an abelian group, we can combine its elements using the usual group operations. We write operations additively, using \(e_1 + e_2\) for the group operation, \(-e\) for inverse and \(0\) for the unit. We also regard expressions built from variables and the group operations up to the abelian group axioms. For example, we regard \(e_1 + (e_2 + e_3)\) and \((e_1 + e_2) + e_3\) as equivalent.

Our language of types includes the unit type \(\text{unit}\) and, for all sorts \(A\) and \(B\), the function type \(A \to B\), the sum type \(A + B\), and the tuple type \(A \times B\). We also assume a primitive type \(\text{real}\), used to represent scalars. Although tuples of real numbers represent points and vectors in geometric applications, we cannot express this via the type \(\text{real} \times \text{real}\). Indeed, two elements of type \(\text{real}\) are related if and only if they are equal and, by Reynolds’ interpretation of tuple types, two elements of \(\text{real} \times \text{real}\) are also related if and only if they are equal. But since this does not give the correct relational interpretations for points and vectors, we introduce a new type \(\text{vec}(e)\), indexed by expressions \(e\) of sort \(T_2\), to represent them. The index \(e\) represents the displacement by change of origin of a point of this type. Although we have taken pains to distinguish geometric points and vectors, we use the name \(\text{vec}\) for both to
recall the computer science notion of vector as a homogeneous
sequence of values with a known length (in this case, 2).

As is standard for parametricity, every type has two interpreta-
tions: an index-erasure interpretation that ignores the indexing ex-
pression, and a relational interpretation as a binary relation on the
index-erasure interpretation. We denote the index-erasure and
relational interpretations with the notations $[\cdot]$ and $[\cdot]$ re-
spectively. To give such interpretations for the types $\text{vec}(e)$ and $\forall t : \text{T}_{\text{T}_2}. A$, we assume for now that we can map each expression $e$ of sort $\text{T}_2$ to an
element $[e]_\rho$ of the group $\text{T}_2$ using some environment $\rho$ that
interprets $e$’s free variables. The index-erasure and relational in-
terpretations of $\text{vec}(e)$ are:

\[
[ \text{vec}(e) ] = \mathbb{R}^2
\]
\[
[ \text{vec}(e) ]_\rho = \{ (\vec{v}, \vec{v}’) \mid \vec{v}’ = \vec{v} + [e]_\rho \}
\]

The index-erasure and relational interpretations of $\forall t : \text{T}_{\text{T}_2}. A$ are:

\[
[ \forall t : \text{T}_{\text{T}_2}. A ] = [ A ]
\]
\[
[ \forall t : \text{T}_{\text{T}_2}. A ]_\rho = \bigcap \{ [A]([\rho, \vec{t})] \mid \vec{t} \in \text{T}_2 \}
\]

The index-erasure and relational interpretations are given formally
in Sections 3.3 and 3.4.

At the end of Section 2.1 we considered functions $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \times
\mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ that preserve all changes of origin. This property
of $f$ can be expressed in terms of types by $f : \forall t : \text{T}_{\text{T}_2}. \text{vec}(t) \times \text{vec}(t) \to
\text{vec}(t)$. Spelling out the relational interpretation of this type
using the definitions above and the standard relational interpretations
for tuple and function types, we recover Statement 2 exactly.

2.3 Affine and Vector Operations

Invariance under change of origin is the key feature of affine
geometry, whose central operation is the affine combination of points:

$\lambda_1 \vec{v}_1 + \lambda_2 \vec{v}_2$, where $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 1$. Geometrically, this can be in-
terpreted as describing all the points on the unique line through the
points represented by $\vec{v}_1$ and $\vec{v}_2$ (assuming $\vec{v}_1 \neq \vec{v}_2$). We add affine
combination of points to our calculus as follows:

\[
\text{affComb} : \forall t : \text{T}_{\text{T}_2}. \text{vec}(t) \to \text{real} \to \text{vec}(t) \to \text{vec}(t)
\]
\[
[\text{affComb}] \vec{v}_1 + r \vec{v}_2 = (1 - r)\vec{v}_1 + r\vec{v}_2
\]

It can be verified by hand that the index-erasure interpretation
\([\text{affComb}]\) is invariant under all changes of origin, as dictated by
its type.

Example 1. The evaluation of quadratic Bézier curves (Bézier
curves with two endpoints and a single control point) can be ex-
pressed using the affine combination primitive as follows:

\[
\text{quadBézier} : \forall t : \text{T}_{\text{T}_2}. \text{vec}(t) \to \text{vec}(t) \to \text{vec}(t) \to \text{vec}(t)
\]
\[
[\text{quadBézier}] p_0, p_1, p_2 s \to \text{affComb} \{ [\text{affComb}] p_0, p_1, p_2 s \}
\]

For two endpoints $p_0$ and $p_2$, a control point $p_1$, and $s \in [0, 1]$,
an application $\text{quadBézier}$ on $p_0$ and $p_2$ gives the point on the curve at “time” $s$. The type of $\text{quadBézier}$ immediately tells us that it
preserves all changes of origin.

The obvious type for vector addition is $(+) : \text{vec}(0) \to
\text{vec}(0) \to \text{vec}(0)$. But we can reflect the fact that $(+) \neq \text{v}

Finally, with the primitive operations of addition and negation
we can define the derived operation of subtraction:

$(-) : \forall t_1, t_2 : \text{T}_{\text{T}_2}. \text{vec}(t_1) \to \text{vec}(t_2) \to \text{vec}(t_1 - t_2)$

$(-) [t_1] [t_2] p_1 p_2 = p_1 - p_2$

Given two points that are invariant with respect to the same
change of origin—i.e., two values of type $\text{vec}(t)$—we can use
subtraction to compute their offset:

\[
\text{offset} : \forall t : \text{T}_{\text{T}_2}. \text{vec}(t) \to \text{vec}(t) \to \text{vec}(0)
\]
\[
\text{offset} [t] p_1 p_2 = p_1 - p_2
\]

The result is a vector expressed with respect to the null change
of origin: note how the algebraic structure on the indexing theory
induces type equalities that can be used to simplify the type of
the result of offset from $\text{vec}(t - t)$ to $\text{vec}(0)$. The type of $(+)$
can also be specialised to the case of moving a point by a vector:

\[
\text{moveBy} : \forall t : \text{T}_{\text{T}_2}. \text{vec}(t) \to \text{vec}(0) \to \text{vec}(t)
\]
\[
\text{moveBy} [t] v = p + v
\]

The types we assign to the remaining vector space primitives,
which we define in Section 3.3. In particular, we define the
operation of subtraction:

\[
\text{vec}(0) \to \text{vec}(0) \to \text{vec}(0)
\]

Noting that $\vec{v}$ is invariant under all changes of basis, as dictated by
its type.

Example 2. The vector space operators and the properties that fol-
low from their types allow us to establish a useful type isomor-
phism. Consider functions with types following the schema:

\[
\tau_n \overset{\text{def}}{=} \forall t : \text{T}_{\text{T}_2}. \text{vec}(t) \to \cdots \to \text{vec}(t) \to \text{vec}(t)
\]

Just by looking at the types $\tau_n$, we know that their inhabitants
will be invariant under change of origin because of the quantifi-
ation over all $t$ in $\text{T}_2$. So we may as well choose one of the input points
as the origin and assume that all the other points are defined with
respect to it. This formalises the common mathematical practice
of stating that “without loss of generality” we can take some point
in a description of a problem to be the origin provided the problem
statement is invariant under translation. Each type $\tau_n$ is isomorphic
with the corresponding type $\sigma_n$:

\[
\sigma_n \overset{\text{def}}{=} \text{vec}(0) \to \cdots \text{vec}(0) \to \text{real}
\]

We demonstrate these isomorphisms formally in Section 4, in the
more general setting of types indexed by abelian groups.

Example 3. So far we have emphasised the derivation of prop-
erties, or “free theorems”, of programs from their types. But us-
ing more refined relational interpretations of types we can also show
that certain types are uninhabited. For example, the type

\[
\forall t : \text{T}_{\text{T}_2}. \text{vec}(t + t) \to \text{vec}(t)
\]

has no inhabitants. Intuitively, this is because we cannot remove the extra $t$ in $\text{vec}(t + t)$ using the
vector operations. We formalise this non-definability result in
Section 5 using a specialised relational interpretation.

2.4 Change of Basis Invariance

Although vector addition, negation, and scaling are not invariant
under change of origin, they are invariant under change of basis.
As with origin invariance, we can express basis invariance as preser-
vation of relations indexed by changes of basis. Change of basis
is achieved by applying an invertible linear map, and the collection
of all such maps on $\mathbb{R}^2$ forms the General Linear group $GL_2$, which
we represent in our language by a new indexing sort $\text{GL}_2$ with
(non-abelian) group structure that we will write multiplici-
tively. We then extend vec to allow indices of sort $\text{GL}_2$, as well as
$\text{T}_2$, so that $\text{vec}(B, t)$ is a vector that varies with change of basis $B$.
and change of origin \( t \). Formally, the index-erasure and relational semantics of \( \text{vec}(B,t) \) are given by:

\[
\begin{align*}
[ \text{vec}(e_B, e_t) ] &= \mathbb{R}^2 \\
[ \text{vec}(e_B, e_t) ]_\rho &= \{ (\vec{v}, \vec{v}') | \vec{v}' = ([t])_\rho \vec{v} + [e_t]_\rho \}
\end{align*}
\]

**Affine Geometry** An affine transformation is an invertible linear map together with a translation. We can assign types to all the primitive affine and vector operations indicating how they behave with respect to affine transformations:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{affComb} : & \forall B : \text{GL}_2, t : \mathbb{T}_2, \\
& \text{vec}(B,t) \rightarrow \text{real} \rightarrow \text{vec}(B,t) \rightarrow \text{vec}(B,t) \\
\text{(+) :} & \forall B : \text{GL}_2, t_1, t_2 : \mathbb{T}_2, \\
& \text{vec}(B, t_1) \rightarrow \text{vec}(B, t_2) \rightarrow \text{vec}(B, t_1 + t_2) \\
\text{negate} : & \forall B : \text{GL}_2, t : \mathbb{T}_2, \\
& \text{vec}(B, t) \rightarrow \text{vec}(B, -t) \\
0 : & \forall B : \text{GL}_2, \text{vec}(B, 0) \\
\text{(*):} & \forall B : \text{GL}_2, \text{real} \rightarrow \text{vec}(B, 0) \rightarrow \text{vec}(B, 0)
\end{align*}
\]

**Euclidean Geometry** Euclidean geometry extends affine geometry with the dot product, or inner product, operation of two vectors. The dot product is defined by \( \langle x_1, y_1 \rangle \cdot \langle x_2, y_2 \rangle = x_1 x_2 + y_1 y_2 \). To assign it a type we note that, although dot product is not invariant under \( \text{GL}_2 \) or \( \mathbb{T}_2 \), it is invariant under the subgroup \( \mathbb{O}_2 \) of \( \text{GL}_2 \) of orthogonal linear transformations, i.e., the subgroup of invertible linear maps whose matrix representations’ transposes are equal to their inverses. We thus introduce a new sort \( \mathbb{O}_2 \) of orthogonal transformations, and overload the multiplicative group operations for inhabitants of \( \mathbb{O}_2 \). Further assuming an injection \( \iota_\mathbb{O} \) that takes \( e : \mathbb{O}_2 \) to \( \iota_\mathbb{O}(e) : \text{GL}_2 \) we assign dot product type:

\[\iota_\mathbb{O} : \forall O : \text{GL}_2, \text{vec}(\iota_\mathbb{O}O, 0) \rightarrow \text{vec}(\iota_\mathbb{O}O, 0) \rightarrow \text{real}\]

The cross product of two vectors is defined on coordinate representations as \( \langle x_1, y_1 \rangle \times \langle x_2, y_2 \rangle = x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1 \). Geometrically, the cross product is the signed area of the parallelogram described by the pair of input vectors. Under change of basis by an invertible linear transformation \( B \), the cross product of two vectors varies with the determinant of \( B \). This corresponds to scaling the plane by the change of basis transformation, so we augment our calculus with a new sort \( \text{GL}_1 \) of scale factors (i.e., 1-dimensional invertible linear maps). Semantically, \( \text{GL}_1 \) ranges over the non-zero real numbers and forms an abelian group which we write multiplicatively. We also add two new operations: determinant, \( \det \) \( B \), which takes an inhabitant of \( \text{GL}_2 \) to its determinant in \( \text{GL}_1 \), and absolute value, \( |e| \), which scales factors to scaling factors. We also refine the type \( \text{real} \) of real numbers so that it is indexed by the sort \( \text{GL}_1 \): \( \text{real}(\epsilon) \). The old type \( \text{real} \) is then just \( \text{real}(1) \), and the full collection of operations on real numbers indexed by scaling factors is shown in Figure 2. We can thus assign cross product the type:

\[\times : \forall B : \text{GL}_2, \text{vec}(B, 0) \rightarrow \text{vec}(B, 0) \rightarrow \text{real}(\det B)\]

Since the absolute value of the determinant of an orthogonal transformation is always 1, we assume \( |\det(\iota_\mathbb{O}O)| = 1 \) to hold for any \( O \in \mathbb{O}_2 \).

**Example 4.** We can use the operations of this subsection to compute the area of a triangle. We have:

\[
\text{area} : \forall B : \text{GL}_2, t : \mathbb{T}_2, \\
\vec{B}(t) \rightarrow \vec{B}(t) \rightarrow \vec{B}(t) \rightarrow \text{real}(\det B) \\
[\text{area} | B \{ p_1 \ p_2 \ p_3 \} = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{abs} ( (p_2 - p_1) \times (p_3 - p_1))]
\]

The calculation is performed in several steps, each of which removes some of the symmetry described by the type of area. First, the two offset vectors \( p_2 - p_1 \) and \( p_3 - p_1 \) are computed. These operations remove the effect of translations on the result in exactly the same way as the type isomorphism in Example 2. Next, we compute the cross product of the two vectors, which gives the area of the parallelogram described by the sides of the triangle and has type \( \text{real}(\det B) \). This removes some of the symmetry due to invertible linear maps, but the cross product still varies with the sign of the determinant. We remove this symmetry as well using \( \text{abs} \). This gives a value of type \( \text{real}(\det B) \) which we multiply by \( \frac{1}{2} \) to recover the area of the triangle rather than that of the whole parallelogram. If we specialise \( \text{area} \) to just orthogonal transformations, the assumption \( |\det(\iota_\mathbb{O}O)| = 1 \) gives the following type:

\[
\text{area} : \forall O : \mathbb{O}_2, t : \mathbb{T}_2, \\
\vec{\iota_\mathbb{O}O}(t) \rightarrow \vec{\iota_\mathbb{O}O}(t) \rightarrow \vec{\iota_\mathbb{O}O}(t) \rightarrow \text{real}(1)
\]

This type shows that the area of a triangle is invariant under orthogonal transformations and translations. Combinations of such transformations are isometries, i.e., distance preserving maps.

**2.5 Scale Invariance and Dimensional Analysis**

Indexing types by scaling factors brings us to the original inspiration for the current work: Kennedy’s interpretation of his units of measure type system via scaling invariance [13]. Kennedy shows how interpreting types in terms of scaling invariance brings the techniques of dimensional analysis to bear on programming. The types of the real number arithmetic operations in Figure 2 are exactly the types Kennedy assigns in his units of measure system, except for that of the absolute value operation. Semantically, our type indexes by non-zero scaling factors, whereas Kennedy’s indexes by strictly positive ones.

In our two-dimensional setting we can add to Kennedy’s one-dimensional scaling invariance an operation \( \iota_1 \) that, semantically, takes scale factors in \( \text{GL}_1 \) to invertible linear maps in \( \text{GL}_2 \), i.e., takes numbers \( s \) to matrices \( \begin{pmatrix} s & 0 \\ 0 & s \end{pmatrix} \). This operation satisfies the equation \( \det(\iota_1 s) = s^2 \), indicating that scaling the plane by \( s \) in both directions scales areas by \( s^2 \).

**Example 5.** Just as we specialised the type of the area function to orthogonal transformations in Example 4, we can also specialise area’s type to scaling transformations. This yields the type:

\[
\text{area} : \forall s : \text{GL}_1, t : \mathbb{T}_2, \\
\vec{\iota_1s}(t) \rightarrow \vec{\iota_1s}(t) \rightarrow \vec{\iota_1s}(t) \rightarrow \text{real}(s^2)
\]

As expected, the area of a triangle varies with the square of scalings of the plane, and this is reflected in the type.

Linear maps of the form \( \begin{pmatrix} s & 0 \\ 0 & s \end{pmatrix} \), as generated by \( \iota_1 \), commute with all other invertible linear maps. We thus require \( \iota_1 s B = B \iota_1 s \) to hold. The scaling maps \( \begin{pmatrix} s & 0 \\ 0 & s \end{pmatrix} \) are precisely the elements of \( \text{GL}_2 \) that commute with all others; these form the centre of \( \text{GL}_2 \). If we keep track of scalings, then we can assign the more precise types to scalar multiplication and dot product. These are shown in Figure 3, which summarises the most general types of all the vector operations that we have described.
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Example 6. With the operations in Figure 2, it is not possible to write a term with the following type that is not constantly zero:

\[ \forall s, GL_2, \text{real}(s^2) \rightarrow \text{real}(s) \]

This was shown by Kennedy for his units of measure system [13]. In particular, it is not possible to write a square root function with the type above—then it is still not possible to construct the cube root function. The non-definability of cube root is related to the impossibility of trisecting an arbitrary angle by ruler and compass constructions.

3. A General Framework

We now present our framework for algebraically indexed types and its relational interpretation. We define the syntax of algebraically indexed types (Section 3.1) and a syntax for terms in a general programming language for algebraically indexed types (Section 3.2). We give an index-erasure semantics to types and terms (Section 3.3), and based on this semantics define notions of contextual equivalence and type isomorphism. We then introduce a relational semantics for types parameterised by an appropriate 'model' of the algebraic theory (Section 3.4), prove the central Abstraction Theorem and use the relational semantics to define a notion of semantic equivalence that soundly approximates contextual equivalence (Section 3.5).

We will use a type system for affine geometry as a running example throughout, so that by the end of the section we have prepared enough syntactic and semantic gadgets to let us prove invariance and abstraction properties for geometric examples in Section 4.

3.1 Algebraically-Indexed Types

The index expressions and types of an instantiation of our general framework are derived from the following data:

1. A collection \textit{Sort} of index sorts. We use the meta-syntactic variables \( s, s_1, s_2, \ldots \) for arbitrary sorts taken from \textit{Sort}.

2. A collection \textit{IndexOp} of index operations, with a function \textit{opArity} : \textit{IndexOp} \rightarrow \textit{Sort} \times \textit{Sort}. (We use the notation \( A' \) to denote the set of lists of elements of some set \( A \).)

3. A collection \textit{PrimType} of primitive types, with a function \textit{tyArity} : \textit{PrimType} \rightarrow \textit{Sort}*, describing the sorts of the arguments of each primitive type.

Example (Geometry: syntax). The two-dimensional geometry system has a sort for each of the geometric groups mentioned in Section 2, so \textit{Sort} = \{ \textit{GL}_2, \textit{O}_2, \textit{GL}_1 \}. We have additive group structure on \textit{T}_2, multiplicative group structure on \textit{GL}_2, \textit{GL}_1, \textit{O}_2, and \textit{O}_1, injections from \textit{O}_2 and \textit{GL}_1 into \textit{GL}_2, determinant and absolute value. Thus, \textit{IndexOp} = \{ 0, +, \ldots, \textit{GL}_2, \textit{GL}_1, \textit{GL}_1, \textit{GL}_1 \}, and

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{opArity}(0) = ([], \textit{T}_2) & \quad \text{opArity}(12) = ([], \textit{G}) \\
\text{opArity}(+) = ([\textit{T}_2, \textit{T}_2], \textit{T}_2) & \quad \text{opArity}(\textit{GL}_2) = ([\textit{G}, \textit{G}], \textit{G}) \\
\text{opArity}(\ldots) = ([\textit{T}_2, \textit{T}_2], \textit{T}_2) & \quad \text{opArity}(\textit{GL}_1) = ([\textit{G}, \textit{G}], \textit{G}) \\
\text{opArity}(\text{det}) = ([\textit{GL}_2, \textit{GL}_1]) & \quad \text{opArity}(\text{det}) = ([\textit{GL}_1, \textit{GL}_1])
\end{align*}
\]

The intended interpretations of the top three pairs of operations are group unit, group combination and group negation, respectively. When we discuss equational theories on index expressions in Section 3.1.2 we will impose the (abelian) group laws. For this example, we also have \textit{PrimType} = \{ \textit{vec.real} \}, with \textit{tyArity} : \textit{vec.real} = \textit{[GL}_2, \textit{T}_2] \}.

We use \textit{bool} as an abbreviation for \textit{unit} + \textit{unit}. The rule \textit{TyPrim} forms, from a primitive type \textit{X} and appropriately sorted index expressions \( e_1, \ldots, e_n \), the well-indexed type \( \textit{X}(e_1, \ldots, e_n) \). The rule \textit{Tyforall} forms universally quantified types, where the universal quantification ranges over all index expressions of some sort. Existential types, formed using the \textit{TyEx} rule, allow for abstraction by hiding.

3.1.1 Substitution of Index Expressions

It is convenient to express substitution of index expressions in terms of simultaneous substitutions. Given a pair of index contexts \( \Delta \) and \( \Delta' = i_1 : s_1, \ldots, i_n : s_n \), a (simultaneous) substitution \( \Delta \vdash \sigma \rightarrow \Delta' \) is a sequence of expressions \( \sigma = (e_1, \ldots, e_n) \) such that \( \Delta \vdash e_j : s_j \) for all \( 1 \leq j \leq n \). Given a substitution \( \Delta \vdash \sigma \rightarrow \Delta' \) and a variable \( i : s \) in \( \Delta' \), we write \( \sigma(i) \) for the index expression \( e_i \). We write \( \Delta \vdash \Delta' \) for the set of all substitutions \( \sigma \) such that \( \Delta \vdash \sigma \rightarrow \Delta' \). We can think of any sequence of sorts as an index context. In particular, we will make use of substitutions of the form \( \Delta \vdash \sigma \rightarrow \text{tyArity}(X) \), since these are exactly sequences of index arguments suitable for the primitive type \( X \). By further abuse of notation, we write \( \Delta \vdash \text{tyArity}(X) \) for the set of all substitutions \( \sigma \) such that \( \Delta \vdash \sigma \rightarrow \text{tyArity}(X) \).

For a substitution \( \Delta \vdash \sigma \rightarrow \Delta' \), where \( \Delta' = i_1 : s_1, \ldots, i_n : s_n \), and a variable/sort pair \( i : s \) such that \( i \) does not appear in either \( \Delta \) or \( \Delta' \), we can form the lifted substitution \( \Delta, i : s \vdash \sigma_{i = a} = (\sigma(i_1), \ldots, \sigma(i_n), i) \rightarrow \Delta' : i : s \). Application of a substitution \( \Delta \vdash \sigma \rightarrow \Delta' \) to a well-sorted index expression \( \Delta \vdash \sigma \rightarrow e : s \) yields a well-sorted index expression \( \Delta \vdash \sigma^* e : s \). The expression \( \sigma^* e \) is defined on variables as \( \sigma^* i \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sigma(i) \), and on operation symbols as \( \sigma^* \text{op} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \text{op} (\sigma^* e_1, \ldots, \sigma^* e_n) \). Given \( \Delta \vdash A \) type, we have \( \Delta \vdash \sigma^* A \) type. The key clauses defining \( \sigma^* A \) are for
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primitive types and the universal and existential quantifiers:

\[ \sigma^*(\langle e_1, \ldots, e_n \rangle) \overset{\text{def}}{=} X(\sigma^* e_1, \ldots, \sigma^* e_n) \]

\[ \sigma^* (\forall i : s. A) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \forall i : s. \sigma^*_i A \]

\[ \sigma^* (\exists i : s. A) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \exists i : s. \sigma^*_i A \]

The identity substitution \( \Delta \vdash i : \Delta \Rightarrow \Delta = i : \Delta \) where \( \Delta = i_1 : s_1, \ldots, i_n : s_n \). The composition of two substitutions \( \Delta \vdash \sigma \Rightarrow \Delta' \) and \( \Delta' \vdash \sigma' \Rightarrow \Delta'' \), where \( \sigma' = (e'_1, \ldots, e'_n) \), is defined as \( \Delta \vdash \sigma' \circ \sigma \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\sigma^* e'_1, \ldots, \sigma^* e'_n) \Rightarrow \Delta'' \). Given a context \( \Delta = i_1 : s_1, \ldots, i_n : s_n, \) and a variable/sort pair \( i : s \) such that \( i \) does not appear in \( \Delta \), we define the projection substitution \( \Delta, i : s \vdash \pi_i \Delta \Rightarrow \Delta \) as \( \pi_i \Delta = (i_1, \ldots, i_{i-1}, i_{i+1}, \ldots, i_n) \).

3.1.2 Index Expression Equality and Type Equality

Much of the power of indexing types by the expressions of an algebraic theory comes from the equations of the theory. For example, in Section 2 the types \( \text{vec}(B, t_1 + t_2) \) and \( \text{vec}(B, t_2 + t_1) \) are considered equal by the type system because \( + \) is commutative. In the general framework, the equations between types are derived from a set \( \text{IndexAx} \) of axioms \( \Delta \vdash e \overset{\text{ax}}{=} e' : s \) that are well-sorted, in the sense that both \( \Delta \vdash e : s \) and \( \Delta \vdash e' : s \) hold.

Given a set \( \text{IndexAx} \) of axioms, we generate the equality judgment between index expressions \( \Delta \vdash e \overset{\text{ax}}{=} e' : s \) by a set of rules. The following rule lets us use substitution instances of the form:

\[ (\Delta \vdash e \overset{\text{ax}}{=} e' : s) \in \text{IndexAx} \quad \Delta \vdash \sigma \Rightarrow \Delta' \]

\[ \Delta \vdash \sigma^* e \overset{\text{ax}}{=} \sigma^* e' : s \]

We also assume the standard congruence, reflexivity, symmetry and transitivity rules for the equality judgment.

Example (Geometry: axioms). In Section 2 we assumed various equational axioms for indexing expressions standing for elements of geometric groups. Assuming the abelian group axioms for translations we can formalise this in our framework:

\[ t : T_2 \vdash t + 0 \overset{\text{ax}}{=} t : T_2 \]

\[ t_1, t_2, t_3 : T_2 \vdash t_1 + (t_2 + t_3) \overset{\text{ax}}{=} (t_1 + t_2) + t_3 : T_2 \]

\[ t : T_2 \vdash t + (-t) \overset{\text{ax}}{=} 0 : T_2 \]

\[ t_1, t_2 : T_2 \vdash t_1 + t_2 \overset{\text{ax}}{=} t_2 + t_1 : T_2 \]

Similarly, the sort of scale factors \( GL_1 \) forms an abelian group under multiplication, and the sorts \( GL_2 \) and \( O_2 \) form (non-abelian) multiplicative groups, so we assume the appropriate axioms. We also assume that the operations \( \text{op}(o, t_1), \text{det} \) and \( | \cdot | \) are group homomorphisms, and that expressions of the form \( t_1(s) \) commute with group multiplication in the sort \( GL_2 \). The absolute value of the determinant of an orthogonal transformation is always 1, so we also assume \( |\text{det}(t_2 O)| \overset{\text{ax}}{=} 1 \). Similarly, scaling maps have a determin-
interprets open terms as functions that map environments to final values.

**Interpretation of Types.** The defining feature of the index erasure interpretation is that semantics of a well-indexed type \( \times (e_1, \ldots, e_n) \) is determined solely by the primitive type \( \times \) and not by the index expressions \( e_1, \ldots, e_n \). We thus assume each primitive type \( \times \in \text{PrmType} \) is assigned a set \([X]\) and extend this assignment to well-indexed types by induction on the type structure:

\[
\begin{align*}
[\text{unit}] \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{\ast\} & \\
\{A \times B\} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{A\} \times \{B\} & \\
\{A \rightarrow B\} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{A\} \rightarrow \{B\} & \\
\{\forall \alpha \in \Delta \cdot M: A\} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{A\} & \\
\{\forall \alpha \in \Delta \cdot \forall \beta \in \Delta \cdot M: A\} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{A\} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

(We will overload the notation \([\cdot]\) for all index-erasures interpretations, and reserve notation \([\cdot]\) for the index-observing relational semantics defined later.)

The index-erasure interpretation completely ignores index expressions and quantifiers, and type equality is defined as an extension of index equality. Therefore, it is straightforward to prove that equal types have equal denotations when interpreted in the index-erasure semantics, and that substitution of index terms has no effect on the index-erasure interpretation of types:

**Lemma 1.**
1. If \( \Delta \vdash A \equiv B \) type then \([A] = [B] \); and
2. If \( \Delta \vdash A \) type and \( \Delta \vdash \sigma \Rightarrow \Delta' \), then \([\sigma^* A] = [A] \).

**Interpretation of Terms.** We assign an index-erasure semantics to any well-indexed typing context \( \Delta \vdash \Gamma \text{ ctx} \) by induction: \([\epsilon] = \{\ast\} \) and \([\Gamma, x : A] = [\Gamma] \times [A] \). For a well-typed term \( \Delta; \Gamma \vdash M : A \), we define the erasure interpretation as a function \([M] : [\Gamma] \rightarrow [A] \) that completely ignores the indexing information. In light of Lemma 1, we do this directly on the syntax of well-typed terms, rather than on typing derivations. The definition of \([M] \) is completely standard, except for the clauses for universal and existential types:

\[
\begin{align*}
[A] \cdot M \eta & \overset{\text{def}}{=} [M] \eta & [M[e]] \eta & \overset{\text{def}}{=} [M] \eta \\
\{[\epsilon], M\} \eta & \overset{\text{def}}{=} [M] \eta & \{N\} \eta & \overset{\text{def}}{=} [N] \eta, [M] \eta \\
\end{align*}
\]

For any particular theory we assume that there is an interpretation of the primitive operations \( \eta_{\text{ops}} \in [\Gamma_{\text{ops}}] \).

**Example (Geometry: interpretation).** The two-dimensional geometric instantiation of the general framework uses the assignment \( [\text{vec}] = \mathbb{R}^2 \) and \([\text{real}] = \mathbb{R} \). We assume that \( \eta_{\text{ops}} \) gives the usual interpretation to scalar and vector operations from Figure 2 and Figure 3.

**Contextual Equivalence.** We use our index-erasure semantics to define when a pair of terms are contextually equivalent with respect to syntactically defined contexts, following Hofmann [11].

Given an index context \( \Delta = i_1; s_1; i_2; s_2; \ldots; i_n; s_n \), we write \( \forall \Delta.A \) for \( \forall i_1; s_1; i_2; s_2; \ldots; i_n; s_n. A \), and similarly for \( \Delta.M \) and \( \Delta.l \).

**Definition 1 (Contextual Equivalence).** Two terms \( \Delta; \Gamma_{\text{ops}} \vdash M_1 : M_2 \) are contextually equivalent, written \( \Delta; \Gamma \vdash M_1 \equiv M_2 \), if for all contexts \( \Delta, \Gamma_{\text{ops}} \vdash C : (\forall \Delta, \Gamma \rightarrow A) \rightarrow \text{bool} \) it is the case that \([C \cdot (\Lambda \Delta. \Lambda \Gamma. M_1)] \eta_{\text{ops}} = [C \cdot (\Lambda \Delta. \Lambda \Gamma. M_2)] \eta_{\text{ops}} \).

**Type Isomorphism.** We say that well-indexed types \( \Delta \vdash A \) type and \( \Delta \vdash B \) type are isomorphic, and write \( \Delta \vdash A \cong B \), if there exist maps between them that are mutually inverse with respect to contextual equivalence, i.e., if there are terms \( \Delta; \Gamma \vdash \lambda : A \rightarrow B \) such that \( \Delta; \Gamma; x : A \vdash J(y) \cong x : A \) and \( \Delta; y : B \vdash I(J(y)) \cong y : B \). That \( \cong \) is a congruence with respect to the type formation rules of Figure 4 is straightforward. We can also derive isomorphisms that are independent of the indexing theory, such as \( \Delta \vdash A \times B \cong B \times A \), and \( \Delta \vdash \forall i : A \rightarrow B \cong A \rightarrow \forall i.A \) for \( i \) not free in \( A \).

### 3.4 The Relational Interpretation of Types

The relational semantics of the well-indexed type \( \Delta \vdash A \) type is a binary relation on the index-erasure interpretation of \( A \). We write \( \text{Rel}(X) \) for the set of binary relations \( R \subseteq X \times X \) on the set \( X \).

For the unit, tuple, sum and function types we define the relational interpretation as a standard logical relation. The relational interpretations of primitive types with index arguments and the universally quantified types require an interpretation of index contexts.

An index environment \( p \) assigns to each index variable \( i : s \) in the context \( \Delta \) a value drawn from an interpretation of the sort \( s \) that soundsly models the equational theory associated with \( s \). We call such an interpretation a model: it assigns to each index operation in the equational theory a corresponding operation in the interpretation, so that index expressions can be interpreted by recursion on their structure.

For example, the sort \( T_s \) of translations can be modelled by any abelian group. An obvious candidate here is the additive group over
\(R^2\), which we will use to obtain invariance under translation; but we could use the additive group \(\mathbb{Q}\), or even a finite group such as the two-element group \(\mathbb{Z}_2\).

**Models.** A model assigns to each sort \(s \in \text{Sort}\) a carrier set \([s]\), and assigns to each operation \(f \in \text{IndexOp}\) with \(\text{opArity}(f) = (s_1, \ldots, s_n, s)\), a function \([f]: [s_1] \times \cdots \times [s_n] \rightarrow [s]\).

An index context \(\Delta = (1_1; s_1, \ldots, i_n; s_n)\) is interpreted as cartesian product, i.e., \([\Delta] \overset{\text{def}}{=} [s_1] \times \cdots \times [s_n]\). For each well-sorted index expression \(\Delta \vdash e : s\), we assign a function \([e]: [\Delta] \rightarrow [s]\) by recursion on the structure of \(e\):

\[
[e]_\rho \overset{\text{def}}{=} \rho(i) \quad [e_1, \ldots, e_n]_\rho \overset{\text{def}}{=} [e_1]([e_1]_\rho, \ldots, [e_n]_\rho)
\]

Finally, a model must be sound, that is, for each axiom \(\Delta \vdash e \overset{\text{def}}{=} e': s \in \text{IndexAx}\), we have \([e] = [e']\).

**Example (Geometry: affine model).** We define the model of the indexing theory for the two-dimensional geometry example as follows. Each of the sorts is interpreted just as its semantic counterpart:

\[
[T_2] = T_2 \quad [GL_2] = GL_2 \quad [O_2] = O_2 \quad [GL_1] = GL_1
\]

Each of the index operations (e.g., the group structure and determinant) is interpreted by the intended semantic operation, and clearly satisfies the axioms in Example 3.1.2. \(\square\)

Given \(\rho \in [\Delta]\) and a substitution \(\Delta \vdash \sigma \Rightarrow \Delta'\) with \(\sigma = (e_1, \ldots, e_n)\), we can derive the composed index environment \(\rho \circ \sigma \overset{\text{def}}{=} ([e_1]_\rho, \ldots, [e_n]_\rho)\).

**Relational interpretation of primitive types.** Having fixed a model we next choose a relational interpretation of primitive types: for each primitive type \(X\), its relational interpretation is parameterised by elements from the model: \([X]: \text{TyArity}(X) \rightarrow \text{Rel}(X)\).

**Example (Geometry: change of basis interpretation).** For each operation \(\text{vec}(B, t)\) and \(\text{real}(s)\), we use \([\text{vec}]: [B, t] = \{(v, Bv + t) \mid v \in R^2\}\) and \([\text{real}]: [k] = \{(x, kx) \mid x \in R\}\).

**Relational interpretation of types.** We assign a relational interpretation to all well-indexed types \(\Delta \vdash A\) type by induction on their derivations, parameterised by index environments \(\rho \in [\Delta]\):

\[
[\text{unit}]_\rho \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{\ast, \ast\} \\
[X(e_1, \ldots, e_n)]_\rho \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{[e_1]_\rho, \ldots, [e_n]_\rho\} \\
[A \rightarrow B]_\rho \overset{\text{def}}{=} [A]_\rho \bowtie [B]_\rho \\
[A \times B]_\rho \overset{\text{def}}{=} [A]_\rho \bowtie [B]_\rho \\
[A + B]_\rho \overset{\text{def}}{=} [A]_\rho \bowtie [B]_\rho \\
[\text{sym}: A]_\rho \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup \{([A]_\rho, m) \mid m \in [s]\} \\
[\text{inh}: A]_\rho \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup \{([A]_\rho, m) \mid m \in [s]\}
\]

In this definition, the relational interpretation of an application of a primitive type \([X(e_1, \ldots, e_n)]_\rho\) is built from the relational interpretation of the primitive type, \([X]\), and the interpretation of the index terms \(e_1, \ldots, e_n\) in the index environment \(\rho\). Universal and existential quantification are interpreted by the set-theoretic intersection and union, respectively, over all extensions of the index environment.

We have also used the following standard constructions on binary relations: if \(R \in \text{Rel}(X)\) and \(S \in \text{Rel}(Y)\), then \(R \bowtie S \in \text{Rel}(X \rightarrow Y)\) is \(\{(f_1, f_2) \mid \forall (a_1, a_2) \in R. (f_1(a_1), f_2(a_2)) \in S\}\). and \(R \bowtie S \in \text{Rel}(X \times Y)\) is \(\{(a_1, b_1), (a_2, b_2) \mid (a_1, a_2) \in R \land (b_1, b_2) \in S\}\), and \(R \bowtie S \in \text{Rel}(X + Y)\) is \(\{(\text{inl} \ x, \text{inl} \ y) \mid (x, y) \in R\} \cup \{(\text{inr} \ y, \text{inr} \ y) \mid (y, y) \in S\}\).

The following lemma states that the relational interpretation of types that we have defined in this section behaves well: the first part of the lemma states that two types that are judgmentally equal are given equal relational interpretations, and the second part states that substitution of index expressions in types can be interpreted by the composition of index environments with substitutions.

**Lemma 2.** 1. If \(\Delta \vdash A \equiv B\) type, then \([A] = [B]\).
2. If \(\Delta' \vdash A\) type then for all \(\Delta \vdash \sigma \Rightarrow \Delta'\) and \(\rho \in [\Delta]\), \([\sigma^* A]_\rho = [A]_\rho \bowtie [\rho]\).

Note that the equations in both parts of Lemma 2 are well-typed by virtue of the corresponding parts of Lemma 1.

**3.5 The Abstraction Theorem and Semantic Equivalence**

Our main result (Theorem 1) is that the index-erasure semantics of every well-typed term is related to itself in the relational interpretation of its type: this is the Abstraction Theorem for every instantiation of our general framework.

**The Abstraction Theorem.** We now state the Abstraction Theorem for well-typed terms. To state and prove this theorem for open terms, we extend the relational interpretation of types to typing contexts. The relational interpretation of contexts is defined by:

\[
[e]_\rho \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{(\ast, \ast)\} \\
[\Gamma, x : A]_\rho \overset{\text{def}}{=} [\Gamma]_\rho \bowtie [A]_\rho
\]

The relational interpretation of contexts inherits from the relational interpretation of types the property of interpreting the application of substitutions as composition:

**Lemma 3.** If \(\Delta' \vdash \Gamma\) \(\text{ctxt}\) and \(\Delta \vdash \sigma \Rightarrow \Delta'\), then for all \(\rho \in [\Delta]\), we have \([\sigma^\ast \Gamma]_\rho = [\Gamma]_\rho \bowtie [A]_\rho\).

Given a particular choice of model and relational interpretation of primitive types, we can then prove the following.

**Theorem 1 (Abstraction).** If \(\Delta; \Gamma \vdash M : A\), then for all \(\rho \in [\Delta]\) and \(\eta_1, \eta_2 \in [\Gamma]\) such that \((\eta_1, \eta_2) \in [\Gamma]_\rho\), we have \([(M_1)_\eta_1, (M_2)_\eta_2] \in [A]_\rho\).

**Proof.** By induction on the typing derivation, making use of Lemma 2 (part 1) for rule \(\text{TEnv}\), Lemma 2 (part 2) for rules \(\text{UNIVapp}\) and \(\text{EXPack}\), and Lemma 3 for rules \(\text{UNIVars}\) and \(\text{EXPunpack}\). The details can be found in the Coq development. \(\square\)

Semantic equivalence of terms is defined in terms of the relational interpretation. As a consequence of Theorem 1, semantic equivalence is a sound approximation of contextual equivalence.

Let \(\eta_{\text{ops}}\) be the context of primitive operations and \(\eta_{\text{ops}}\) its interpretation. Fix a model and relational interpretation of primitive types so that \((\eta_{\text{ops}}, \eta_{\text{ops}}) \in [\Gamma_{\text{ops}}]_\ast\).

**Definition 2 (Semantic equivalence).** Two terms \(\Delta; \Gamma_{\text{ops}}; \Gamma \vdash M_1, M_2 : A\) are semantically equal, written \(\Delta; \Gamma \vdash M_1 \sim M_2 : A\), if for all \(\rho \in [\Delta]\) and all \((\eta_1, \eta_2) \in [\Gamma]_\rho\), we have \([(M_1)_\eta_1, (M_2)_\eta_2] \in [A]_\rho\).

**Theorem 2 (Soundness).** If \(\Delta; \Gamma \vdash M_1 \sim M_2 : A\) then \(\Delta; \Gamma \vdash M_1 \approx M_2 : A\).

4. **Geometric Consequences of Abstraction**

We now instantiate our general framework with the indexing theory of Section 2, and present more general and formally-justified free theorems, type isomorphisms, and non-definability results. For the free theorems and isomorphisms, we use the model and relational...
interpretation of affine types described in Section 3.4, namely that of affine transformations for vectors and scaling for scalars.

### 4.1 Free Theorems
Consider the type of the triangle area function from Example 4:

```
area :: ∀B:GL₂, t:T₂,
vec(B,t) → vec(B,t) → vec(B,t) → real(|det B|)
```

By Theorem 1, we can derive the following free theorem. For all \( B \in \mathbb{GL}_2 \), \( t \in T_2 \), and \( \vec{z}, \vec{y}, \vec{z} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \), we have

\[
|\text{det } B| \cdot \text{area } \vec{z} \vec{y} \vec{z} = |\text{area } (B \vec{z} + \vec{t}) (B \vec{y} + \vec{t}) (B \vec{z} + \vec{t})|
\]

Thus, directly from the type of the area function, we can see that its

index-erasure semantics is (a) invariant under translations, and (b) if
the inputs are subjected to a linear transformation \( B \), the output
varies with the absolute value of the determinant of \( B \).

### 4.2 Type Isomorphisms
Types indexed by abelian groups induce a particularly rich theory of

isomorphic types; previous work on units of measure [13]
relates these to Buckingham’s theorem from dimensional analysis.

Here we consider the additive abelian groups of translations and
the multiplicative abelian group of scalings.

### Translations
Consider first the group \( T_2 \) of translations

from Section 2.2 and Section 2.3.

Example 7 (Geometry: wlog). We prove that

\[
\Delta_{B:GL₂} \vdash \forall\langle t: T₂, \vec{v}: \vec{B}(B, t) \rangle \rightarrow \vec{v}(B, 0).
\]

Let

\[
X \overset{\text{def}}{=} \forall\langle t: T₂, \vec{v}: \vec{B}(B, t) \rangle \rightarrow \vec{v}(B, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad Y \overset{\text{def}}{=} \vec{B}(B, 0)
\]

Then

\[
\Delta_{B:GL₂} \vdash \langle t: T₂, \vec{v}: \vec{B}(B, t) \rangle \rightarrow A \equiv A[0/t]
\]

**Proof.** Let

\[
X \overset{\text{def}}{=} \forall\langle t: T₂, \vec{v}: \vec{B}(B, t) \rangle \rightarrow A \quad \text{and} \quad Y \overset{\text{def}}{=} A[0/t]
\]

\[
f \overset{\text{def}}{=} \lambda f: X, f[0] (0 [B])
\]

\[
J \overset{\text{def}}{=} \lambda y: \forall\langle t: T₂, \vec{v}: \vec{B}(B, t), \vec{v} \rangle \rightarrow \vec{B}(B, f[0] (0 [B]))
\]

where terms

\[
\Delta_{B:GL₂} \vdash \forall\langle t: T₂, \vec{v}: \vec{B}(B, t) \rangle \rightarrow \vec{B}(B, f[0] (0 [B]))
\]

are defined by induction over the structure of \( f \) and \( B \). For brevity
we omit types on binders; also note that the omitted cases for \( \downarrow^{1⁡} \vec{B}(B) \)

have definition symmetric to \( \downarrow^{1⁡} \vec{B}(B) \):

\[
\uparrow^{1⁡} \vec{B}(B, \vec{e}) = \lambda x. \downarrow^{1⁡} \vec{B}(B, \vec{e}) (x)
\]

for any \( \vec{y} \). It’s easy to prove by induction on \( f \) that

\[
\uparrow^{1⁡} \vec{B}(B, \vec{e}) (y) = \lambda y. \downarrow^{1⁡} \vec{B}(B, \vec{e})(y)
\]

for all \( y \). This isomorphism formalises the equivalence between coordinate-free geometry,
expressed by a polymorphic type whose first argument can be thought of as the origin with respect to which \( A \) is specified, and a coordinate-based geometry, expressed by the type \( A[0/t] \), in which the origin is fixed at \((0,0)\). It is sometimes said that an affine space
is a vector space that has forgotten its origin; we have captured this in a type isomorphism.

**Lemma 4.** Suppose that \( \Delta_{B:GL₂}, t:T₂ \vdash A \) type, \( A \) contains no quantifiers and every occurrence of \( \vec{v} \) is of the form \( \vec{v}(B, ?) \).

Expanding the conclusion, we have to show for any \( \vec{t}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) and \( \vec{v}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \), it is the case that

\[
f'(\rho(B)\vec{v}_0 + \vec{t}_0) = \rho(B)(f(\vec{v}_0)) + \vec{t}
\]

Expanding the conclusion, we have to show for any \( \vec{v}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) and \( \vec{v}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2 \), it is the case that

\[
\big(\big[\downarrow^{1⁡} \vec{B}(B) \big](\eta_{ops}, \vec{v}_0) \big)(t, \vec{t}) = \big[\downarrow^{1⁡} \vec{B}(B) \big](\eta_{ops}, \vec{v}_0)
\]

Unfolding the definitions, we deduce that

\[
\big[\downarrow^{1⁡} \vec{B}(B) \big](\eta_{ops}, \vec{v}_0) = \big[\downarrow^{1⁡} \vec{B}(B) \big](\eta_{ops}, \vec{v}_0)
\]

…

Unfolding the erasure semantics, this amounts to showing that

\[
\forall \vec{v}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2, \big[\downarrow^{1⁡} \vec{B}(B) \big](\eta_{ops}, \vec{v}_0)(t, \vec{t}) = \big[\downarrow^{1⁡} \vec{B}(B) \big](\eta_{ops}, \vec{v}_0)
\]

Thus our goal becomes

\[
\forall \vec{v}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2, \big(\big[\downarrow^{1⁡} \vec{B}(B) \big](\eta_{ops}, \vec{v}_0)(t, \vec{t}) \big) \in \big[\downarrow^{1⁡} \vec{B}(B) \big](\eta_{ops}, \vec{v}_0)
\]

This is obtained immediately by instantiating **Equation 4** with \( \vec{v} = \vec{v}_0 \) and \( \vec{t} = \rho(B)\vec{v}_0 + \vec{t}_0 \).
Example 2 and Example 7 are special cases of this isomorphism. Another instance is the type of vector addition:

\[ \forall B : \text{GL}_2, t_1, t_2 : \text{vec}(B, t_1) \rightarrow \text{vec}(B, t_2) \rightarrow \text{vec}(B, t_1 + t_2) \]

\[ \cong \forall B : \text{GL}_2, t_1, t_2 : \text{vec}(B, t_1) \rightarrow \text{vec}(B, t_2) \] (by Lemma 4)

\[ \cong \forall B : \text{GL}_2, \text{vec}(B, 0) \] (by Lemma 4)

\[ \cong \text{unit} \] (by Theorem 1)

In other words, the vector addition operation is the only inhabitant of its type!

**Scalings** For the group \( \text{GL}_2 \) of scalings we can treat a real-valued argument to a function as a unit of measure with which to scale the result. Although the argument might be zero, and this cannot be used for scaling, we can still obtain the following slightly more complicated isomorphism:

\[ \forall s : \text{GL}_2. \text{real}(s) \rightarrow A \cong A[1/s] \times \forall s : \text{GL}_2. A \] (5)

The type of areaCircle from the introduction is one instance:

\[ \forall s : \text{GL}_2. \text{real}(s) \rightarrow \text{real}(s^2) \]

\[ \cong \text{real}(1) \times (\forall s : \text{GL}_2. \text{real}(s^2)) \] (by Equation 5)

\[ \cong \text{real}(1) \times \text{unit} \] (by Theorem 1)

\[ \cong \text{real}(1) \] (trivially)

### 4.3 Non-definability

To prove non-definability results, the model and relational interpretation used in the previous two sections are not sufficient. This is true even for simple scalars with invariance under scaling. Consider the type \( \forall s : \text{GL}_2. \text{real}(s^2) \rightarrow \text{real}(s) \). There are many functions \( f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) that satisfy its relational interpretation, i.e., for which \( f(k^2 \cdot x) = k \cdot f(x) \) for any \( k \neq 0 \). Consider

\[ f(x) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{x} & \text{if } x > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]

for instance. Yet this type contains only the constant zero function, a fact that we can prove using a surprisingly simple model!

**Example 8.** If \( \Gamma_{ops} \vdash f : \forall s : \text{GL}_2. \text{real}(s^2) \rightarrow \text{real}(s) \) then \( [f] = \lambda x.0 \). To show this, the model

\[
\begin{align*}
&[\text{GL}_2] & 0, 1 & \downarrow 0 \quad -1 \downarrow \text{id} \\
&[\lambda] & \lambda(x, y).((x + y) \text{ mod } 2) \quad [-1] \downarrow \text{id} \\
&[\text{real}] & \Delta_{\mathbb{R}} \quad [\text{real}] \downarrow \text{id},
\end{align*}
\]

in other words, the additive abelian group \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \). Now set

\[ [\text{real}] (z) = \begin{cases} \Delta_{\mathbb{R}} & \text{if } z = 0 \\ \{(0, 0)\} & \text{if } z = 1 \end{cases} \]

It’s easy to check that \( (\eta_{ops}, \eta_{ops}) \in \Gamma_{ops} \).

We think of \( z \) as tracking whether or not exponents on scalar parameters are divisible by 2: all the primitive operations in Figure 2 produce results with even exponents if their inputs have even exponents. But the type under consideration here does not.

By Theorem 1 we have that \( (f, f) \in [\forall s : \text{GL}_2. \text{real}(s^2) \rightarrow \text{real}(s)] \). Expanding the definitions, this means that for any \( z \in [\text{GL}_2] \) and any \( (x, y) \in [\text{real}](z + z) \mod 2 \), it is the case that \( (f(x), f(y)) \in [\text{real}](z) \). Set \( z = 1 \). Then we have that if \( x = y \) then \( f(x) = f(y) = 0 \).

The particular model and relational interpretation used here is devised only to rule out the ‘square root type’ (it does not rule out a ‘cube root type’, for instance); nevertheless, it is possible to devise cruder interpretations that serve up both invariance and more general non-definability results. For example, we can set

\[
[\text{GL}_1] \overset{\text{def}}{=} \text{GL}_1 \times \mathbb{Q} \quad [\cdot] \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\cdot, +) \quad [1] \overset{\text{def}}{=} (1, 0) \quad [-1] \overset{\text{def}}{=} (-1, -) \quad [\cdot, \cdot] \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\cdot, \cdot, \text{id})
\]

and

\[ [\text{real}](k, q) = \begin{cases} \{x, kx\} & \text{if } q \in \mathbb{Z} \\ \{(0, 0)\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]

**Example 9.** Suppose we extend the operations \( \Gamma_{ops} \) of Figure 2 and corresponding \( \eta_{ops} \) with a square root operation typed by

\[ \sqrt{\text{real}} : \forall s : \text{GL}_2. \text{real}(s^2) \rightarrow \text{real}(s) \].

If \( \Gamma_{ops} \vdash f : \forall s : \text{GL}_2. \text{real}(s^3) \rightarrow \text{real}(s) \) then \( [f] = \lambda x.0 \). To show this, take the model

\[ [\text{GL}_1] \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{Q} \quad [\cdot] \overset{\text{def}}{=} + \quad [1] \overset{\text{def}}{=} 0 \quad [-1] \overset{\text{def}}{=} - \quad [\cdot, \cdot] \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\cdot, \cdot, \text{id}) 
\]

in other words, the additive abelian group \( \mathbb{Q} \). Now set

\[ [\text{real}](q) = \begin{cases} \Delta_{\mathbb{R}} & \text{if } \exists n, 2^n q \in \mathbb{Z} \\ \{(0, 0)\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]

It’s easy to check that \( (\eta_{ops}, \eta_{ops}) \in \Gamma_{ops} \).

Here, \( q \) is tracking the exponents on scalar parameters, with \( [\text{real}](q) \) relating only zero to itself unless the denominator of \( q \) is a power of two (a so-called dyadic number). Applying the Abstraction Theorem and expanding, we have that for any \( q \in \mathbb{Q} \) and any \( (x, y) \in [\text{real}](q) \), it is the case that \( (f(x), f(y)) \in [\text{real}](q) \). Set \( q = \frac{1}{3} \). Then we have that if \( x = y \) then \( f(x) = f(y) = 0 \).

### 5. Non-definability for the General Framework

The non-definability results in the previous section required the use of specially crafted models and relational interpretations. It is reasonable to ask whether or not there is a general method for constructing suitable models and relational interpretations to prove non-definability results. In this section, we show that this is possible for a large class of first-order types in any instance of our general framework.

In Example 8, we showed that the type \( \forall s : \text{GL}_2. \text{real}(s^2) \rightarrow \text{real}(s) \) only has trivial inhabitants. Intuitively, this is because the index of the result type \( s \) cannot be obtained from the index of the input type \( s^2 \) using the abelian group operations and axioms. This observation can be used to give a sufficient condition for non-inhabitation for types of the form:

\[ \forall i_1, s_1, \ldots, i_m, s_m. X(e_1) \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow X(e_n) \rightarrow X(e) \]

Roughly speaking, if this type is inhabited, then it must be the case that the index expression \( e \) can be generated from the set of index expressions \( \{e_1, \ldots, e_n\} \).

We assume that we are working with an instantiation of the general framework from Section 3 with a closed typing context \( \Gamma_{ops} \) describing the types of the primitive operations and a chosen index erasure semantics. We will use a special relational interpretation built from the syntax of the indexing expressions to prove our general non-definability result. For simplicity, we assume that there is only one primitive type, \( X \), but the technique we describe here extends to the general case. We also assume that \( X \) is non-empty.

To state our general non-definability condition, we need to define the set of index expressions generated by some finite set of index expressions. Given a set \( S \) of index expressions that are all well-indexed in some index context \( \Delta \), we define \( Gen_{\Delta}(S) \) to be the set of expressions that are built from the elements of \( S \) and the primitive index operations. To account for the equations between
indexing terms, we close under index expression equivalence to get the set $\text{Gen}(S) = \{ e \mid \exists s. \exists e' \in \text{Gen}_0(S), \Delta \vdash e \equiv e' : s \}$. Now a type is well-generated if it is closed and of the form:

$$\forall s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_m : s : \forall e_1 : e : e, x(e_1) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow x(e_m) \rightarrow x(e)$$

and $e \in \text{Gen}(\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\})$.

**Theorem 3.** Assume that the members of $\Gamma_{\text{ops}}$ are all well-generated types. If there exists an $M$ with typing:

$$\Gamma_{\text{ops}} \vdash M : \forall s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_m : s. x(e_1) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow x(e_m) \rightarrow x(e)$$

then $e \in \text{Gen}(\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\})$.

This theorem is usually applied in the contrapositive: if $e \not\in \text{Gen}(\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\})$ then no such $M$ can exist. Note that if $\Gamma_{\text{ops}}$ contains operations corresponding to each of the index-level operations (as, for example, in Figure 2), then this theorem yields a characterisation of definable terms, since the construction of $e$ from $e_1, \ldots, e_n$ can be replicated at the term level.

**Proof.** Let $\Delta = i_1 : s_1, \ldots, i_m : s_m$ be the index context constructed from the universally quantified type variables in the type of $M$. To interpret the index expressions, we use the free model over the variables in $\Delta$ constructed from the syntax. This model assigns to each sort $s$ the set $\{ e \mid \exists \Delta \vdash e : s \}$ of index expressions quotiented by index expression equality. Index operations are interpreted by the corresponding syntactic operation on equivalence classes: $[\Gamma](\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}) = [\Gamma(e_1, \ldots, e_n)]$.

We take the relational interpretation of the primitive type $X$ as:

$$[X](e) = \{(x, e) \mid x \in [X] \land e \in \text{Gen}(\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\})\}$$

It is straightforward to check that for any index-erase interpretation of the primitive operations $\eta_{\text{ops}} \in \Gamma_{\text{ops}}$, we have $\eta_{\text{ops}} \in \Gamma_{\text{ops}}$ because all members of $\Gamma_{\text{ops}}$ have well-generated types. Hence, by Theorem 1, we know that for all terms (i.e., elements of the free model over $\Delta$) $e_1 : s_1, \ldots, e_m : s_m$:

$$\forall (x_1, x_1') \in [X(e_1)](e_1', \ldots, e_m'), \ldots, (x_n, x_n') \in [X(e_n)](e_1', \ldots, e_m'), \ldots, ([M] \eta_{\text{ops}} x_1 \ldots x_n, [M] \eta_{\text{ops}} x_1' \ldots x_n') \in [X(e)](e_1', \ldots, e_m')$$

By setting $e'_j = i_j$ and using an arbitrary element $x \in [X]$ (which we have assumed non-empty), we have, for all $k$, $(x, x) \in [X(e)](i_1, \ldots, i_m)$ since each $e_2$ is a member of the set we are using to generate terms. Now $([M] \eta_{\text{ops}} x_1 \ldots x_n, [M] \eta_{\text{ops}} x_1' \ldots x_n') \in [X](i_1', \ldots, i_m')$ and so $e \in \text{Gen}(\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\})$.

**Application to Example 3** Theorem 3 can be directly applied to show that the type $\forall T : T_2. \text{vec}(t + t) \rightarrow \text{vec}(t)$ has no inhabitants. The free model over the single index variable $t$ is (isomorphic to) the integers, and the sub-model generated by the index expression $t + t$ corresponds to the even integers. The result now follows simply because 1 (i.e., the interpretation of 0) is not an even number.

**Abelian Group Indexed Types** Kennedy [13] has given a general characterisation of definability at first-order in the case of abelian group indexing in terms of integer solutions to a set of linear equations. Specialising Theorem 3 to the case of abelian group indexing yields Kennedy’s characterisation.

**Polymorphic Constants** Theorem 3 does not apply in the case when we have polymorphic constants. This is the case with the polymorphic $0 : \forall s. \text{GL}_1. \text{real}(s)$ in Figure 2. Theorem 3 does not apply because the index expression $s$ is not generated by the empty set: 0’s type is not well-generated. Nevertheless, it is easy to adapt the proof of Theorem 3 to handle a polymorphic constant 0 by setting the relational interpretation of $X$ to be:

$$[X](0) = \{(x, x) \mid x \in [X] \land (x = 0 \lor e \in \text{Gen}(\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}))\}$$

The conclusion of the theorem now states that either $e \in \text{Gen}(\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\})$ or $[M]$ is the constant 0 function. This extended theorem can now be used to give an alternative proof for Example 8. As this example illustrates, there may be many different models that can be used to prove a non-definability result.

**Adding Index Operations** Theorem 3 also does not directly apply in the case of Example 9, again because the assumptions that the types of the primitive operations are all well-generated is not satisfied. In this case, the assumed square root operation has type $\forall s. \text{GL}_1. \text{real}(s^2) \rightarrow \text{real}(s)$, and as we observed at the start of this section, $s$ is not in the set generated by $s^2$. However, to enable the application of the theorem, we can assume an additional index operation $-^{1/2}$, acting like square root at the index level. Now the free model produced in the proof of the theorem is isomorphic to the dyadic numbers with addition and halving, and the generated sub-model consists of the dyadic rationals of the form $\frac{m}{2^n}$. Again there is a diversity of models that can be used to prove a single non-definability result.

6. **Logical Information Flow**

We now apply our general framework to types that are indexed by logical propositions. By including a primitive type that represents logical truth, we can recover—through a construction due to Tse and Zdancewic [21]—strong information flow properties of programs. As a result of our general framework being parameterised by the choice of equational theory, we can alter the logic that we use for reasoning about type equality, and hence alter the information flow properties of the system.

We first recall the concept of information flow. A function $f : A \times B \rightarrow C$ is said to not allow information to flow from its second argument to the output if for all $b, b' \in B$ and all $a \in A$, $f(a, b) = f(a, b')$. If we think of the $B$ argument as representing high-security information, then we have stated that $f$ does not allow the high-security input to flow to the low security output. Information flow can be seen as a kind of invariance property of programs, and so our relational interpretation of types is well-tailored to proving this kind of property.

As described by Sabelfeld and Sands [19], information flow can be captured semantically by partial equivalence relations (PERs). Abadi, Banerjee, Heintze and Riecke [1] built a Core Calculus for Dependency, using a type system based around a security level indexed monad $T_1A$, using PERs to prove the information flow properties. Tse and Zdancewic [21] translated Abadi et al.’s calculus into System F1 translating the monadic type $T_1A$ to $\alpha_1 \rightarrow A$ for some free type variable $\alpha$, and using Reynolds’ Abstracted Theorem to prove information flow properties. For example, if the type variable $\alpha_H$ represents high-level information, then the non-interference property of the function $f$ could be expressed by the System F type $A \rightarrow (\alpha_H \rightarrow B) \rightarrow C$. If a program cannot generate a value of type $\alpha_H$, then it cannot access the value of $B$, and hence is insensitive to the actual value. Relationships between security levels are captured by postulating functions $\alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2$ whenever $l_1$ is a lower security level than $l_2$.

Using algebraic indexing, we refine Tse and Zdancewic’s translation by replacing each type variable $\alpha_1$ with a primitive type $T(\phi_1)$ of representations of the truth of a logical proposition $\phi_1$ that stands for the security level 1. The relationships between security levels are now replaced by logical entailment, so we only have functions of type $T(\phi_1) \rightarrow T(\phi_2)$ when $\phi_1$ entails $\phi_2$. We instantiate our general relational framework to interpret $T(\phi)$ as the identity rela-

---

1 Tse and Zdancewic’s translation did not satisfy all the properties that they claimed, as pointed out by Shikuma and Igarashi [20]. However, this problem is not relevant to our discussion here.
tion if ϕ is true and the empty relation if ϕ is false. We shall see that this recovers the information flow properties of Abadi et al. and Tse and Zdancewic.

**Instantiation of the General Framework** We assume a single indexing sort prop and assume the operations and equations of boolean algebra. Thus we have constants ⊤, ⊥ and binary operators ∧, ∨ with the axioms of a bounded lattice, and a unary complementation operator ¬. We will use ϕ, ψ to stand for index expressions of sort prop. We use an equational presentation of boolean algebras to fit with our general framework, but note that we can define an order on index expressions as ϕ ≤ ψ when ϕ = ϕ ∧ ψ. We have a single primitive type Σ, with tyArity(Σ) = [prop] and index-erasure semantics ⌊x⌋ = {x}. Thus values of type Σ(ϕ) have no run-time content; their only meaning is given by the relational semantics. For the model of the indexing theory, we take an arbitrary boolean algebra L. The relational interpretation of the truth representation type is [Σ](x) = {{*}, | x = ⊤} , where T is the top element of the boolean algebra L. The primitive operations ΓLog reflect logical consequence:

\[
\text{truth : } Σ(T) \quad \text{and} \quad \forall p, q : Σ(T) \rightarrow Σ(T(p ∧ q)) \quad \text{up : } Σ(p ∧ q) \rightarrow Σ(p)
\]

The combination of the ΣyEq rule and the primitive up operation allow for logical entailment to be reflected in programs: if we have ϕ ≤ ψ and M : Σ(ϕ) then up M : Σ(ψ). Each of the primitive operations has a trivial interpretation, due to the index-erasure interpretation of Σ(ϕ) as a one-element set, giving an environment ηLog ∈ [ΓLog]. Less trivially, we have this lemma:

**Lemma 5.** (ηLog, ηLog) ∈ [ΓLog]*.

**Information Flow** We think of logical expressions as “compos-ite principals”. That is, propositional variables representing atomic principals that are combined using the logical connectives. We interpret “truth” for principals as stating that a principal is true when satisfied with the current state of affairs. Thus a relationship ϕ ≤ ψ indicates that satisfaction of the composite principal ϕ implies satisfaction of the composite principal ψ. In terms of security levels, the ordering is reversed: if a high security principal is satisfied, then all of their subordinates must also be satisfied.

We adapt Tse and Zdancewic’s translation of Abadi et al.’s monadic type to our setting. We define a type abbreviation T A = Σ(ϕ) → A, where A is a type and ϕ is an expression of sort prop. For every ϕ, we can endow the types T A ϕ with the structure of a monad. This is due to the fact that it is an instance of the “environment” (or “reader”) monad [12]. We read the types T A ϕ as data of type A “protected” by the principal ϕ.

As a consequence of the relational interpretation given above, it follows that if we have an index expression ϕ that is interpreted as some value other than ⊤ in an index environment ρ, then for all x, x′ ∈ [Σ bool], we have {x, x′} ∈ [Σ bool]ρ. Thus if this principal is dissatisfied (i.e., ϕ ̸= ⊤), then data protected by this principal is indistinguishable from any other data, and a program cannot get access to the exact value. From this observation, and Theorem 1, we obtain the following information flow result:

**Theorem 4.** Let ϕ and ψ be index expressions of sort prop in some indexing context Δ, such that ϕ ≤ ψ. Then for all terms:

\[
\Delta \vdash ΓLog, \Gamma ⊢ M : Σ bool \rightarrow Σ bool
\]

and all terms N1, N2 of type Σ bool, M N1 ≈ N2 holds. Thus there is no information flow from M’s input to its output.

Note that if ψ ≤ ϕ, then it is always possible to write the iden-tity function with this type, using the up operation. The theorem also holds if we move to logics other than boolean logic. For example, if our equational theory models intuitionistic logic by taking the axioms of Heyting algebras, then the same non-flow property for programs of type T prop → bool holds, due to the lack of excluded middle. If we take linear logic, then programs of type T prop → bool have no information flow from their input, due to non-provability of p ⊥ p ∧ p.

### 7. Distance-Indexed Types

The type system for geometry we discussed in Section 2 and Section 4 made use of a relational interpretation of primitive types that relates pairs of elements by some transformation if applying the transformation to the first element of a pair yields the second. Thus, the free theorems that we derived directly take the form of “invariance” properties, where some equation holds between two terms. In this section, we examine another instantiation of our general framework that relates values when they are within a certain distance. The free theorems that we obtain inform us of the effect that programs have on the distances between values. For example, a program M of type:

\[
∀ \epsilon1, \epsilon2 : ℝ^0, \text{real}(\epsilon1) \rightarrow \text{real}(\epsilon2) \rightarrow \text{real}(\epsilon1 + \epsilon2)
\]

must satisfy the property that for all \(\epsilon1, \epsilon2 > 0\) and \(x, x', y, y' \in \mathbb{R}\):

\[
\text{if } |x - x'| < \epsilon1 \text{ and } |y - y'| < \epsilon2 \text{ then } |\left[M \right] ηdelt x - \left[M \right] ηdelt x' y'| < \epsilon1 + \epsilon2
\]

**Instantiation of the General Framework** We assume a single indexing sort ℝ0 to represent positive, non-zero real numbers. For the index operations, we assume the operations min, max, + and multiplication by constant reals. There is a single primitive type real with tyArity(real) = {ℝ0}. The primitive operations Γdelt are as follows, where c stands for arbitrary real-valued constants:

\[
\epsilon : \forall e : ℝ^0, \text{real}(e)
\]

\[
(+): \forall \epsilon1, \epsilon2 : ℝ^0, \text{real}(\epsilon1) \rightarrow \text{real}(\epsilon2) \rightarrow \text{real}(\epsilon1 + \epsilon2)
\]

\[
(-): \forall \epsilon1, \epsilon2 : ℝ^0, \text{real}(\epsilon1) \rightarrow \text{real}(\epsilon2) \rightarrow \text{real}(\epsilon1 + \epsilon2)
\]

\[
c*: \forall c : ℝ^0, \text{real}(c) \rightarrow \text{real}(c)
\]

\[
\text{up : } \forall \epsilon1, \epsilon2 : ℝ^0, \text{real}(\epsilon1) \rightarrow \text{real}(\max(\epsilon1, \epsilon2))
\]

We assume that the index-erasure semantics of the real type is just the set \(\mathbb{R}\), so all except the last operation have straightforward interpretations. The up operation is interpreted just as the identity function. The index-erasure interpretations of the primitive operations are collected together into an environment ηdelt ∈ [Γdelt].

For the relational interpretation we construct a model of the in-dexing theory by interpreting \(Σ^0\) with strictly positive real numbers. We set \(\text{real}(\epsilon) = \{(x, x') | |x - x'| < \epsilon}\).

**Lemma 6.** (ηdelt, ηdelt) ∈ [Γdelt]*.

**Uniform continuity** Using existential types, the standard ε-δ definition of uniform continuity can be expressed as \(∀ε \in ℝ^0, ∃δ : ℝ^0, \text{real}(\delta) \rightarrow \text{real}(ε)\). For any program M of this type, Theorem 1 gives a free theorem that is exactly uniform continuity:

\[
∀ε > 0, ∃δ > 0, ∀x, x', |x - x'| < δ ⇒ \left|M \right] ηdelt x - \left|M \right] ηdelt x' < ε
\]

This definition differs from the ε-δ definition of (regular) continuity by the order of quantification: there, ∀x comes before ∃δ, so the distance δ may depend on x. We suspect that to express standard continuity as a type would require some form of type dependency. Chaudhuri, G을와 and Lublinerman [8] have given a program logic based approach to verifying the continuity of programs.

**Function Sensitivity** A type system with a relational interpretation that tracks distances between values has been investigated by Reed and Pierce [17] in the setting of differential privacy. Their system uses a linear type discipline to ensure that all programs are c-sensitive (i.e., the distance between the outputs is no greater than c times the distance between the inputs, for some constant c). We
can express their central concept of $c$-sensitivity (for functions on the reals) as an algebraically indexed type: $\forall x R^c. \text{real}(\epsilon) \rightarrow \text{real}(\epsilon + c)$. Investigating the precise connection between their system and ours is left to future work.

8. Discussion

We presented a general framework for algebraically indexed types and instantiated it to yield novel type systems for geometry, logical information flow and distance-indexed types. Our framework further demonstrates the power of relational reasoning about typed programs. From Theorem 1, we derived interesting free theorems, type isomorphisms and non-definability results. We conclude with some observations and suggestions for further work.

Further Applications and Extensions

We have covered several applications of algebraically indexed types in this paper, but there are undoubtedly many more. Geometry for dimensions greater than two is an obvious candidate, as are systems that are invariant under different geometric groups (e.g., the Poincaré group for relativity). Mathematical Physics is particularly rich in theories that have some notion of invariance, and it will be exciting to pin down the precise connections between these and type systems for which an Abstraction Theorem holds. Cardelli and Gardner describe a process calculus that builds in 3D affine geometry [5], proving that process behaviour is invariant under affine transformations. Distinguishing points from vectors provides the appropriate abstraction barrier, and the geometric group is determined by inspecting term syntax. It would be interesting to recast their language in terms of our indexed types to obtain purely type-based invariance theorems.

Geometric theorem proving is another application. Harrison [10] comments on the pervasiveness of invariance properties in this area. Programs in our framework automatically satisfy invariance properties, removing the need for ad hoc proofs of these facts.

Type and effect analyses use types indexed by effect annotations with algebraic structure (e.g., sets of read/write effect labels with an idempotent monoid structure). Benton et al. have used relational interpretations to prove effect-dependent equivalences [4]. An extension of our framework with type-indexed types should be able to express their effect-indexed monads and prove their equivalences.

Extending our framework with type dependency would also allow for further applications. For example, we could consider a type of lists of length $n$, indexed by elements of the permutation group $S_n$. Bernardy et al. have presented a general framework for relational reasoning and an Abstraction Theorem for dependent types [3]. However, they work with pure type systems, which define type equality via untyped rewriting, so it is not immediately obvious how to integrate arbitrary equational theories into their framework.

Semantic Equality

In general, the semantic equality in Definition 2 is not an equivalence relation. If the interpretations of all primitive types are partial equivalence relations then semantic equality is indeed an equivalence relation. However, this excludes the geometry and distance-indexed examples. More generally, we can consider relational interpretations that are difunctional. (A relation is difunctional if whenever $(x, y), (x', y')$ and $(x, y')$ are in the relation then so is $(x', y,y)$.) Difunctionality is weaker than being a PER, but still suffices to prove that semantic equality is an equivalence relation. Hofmann [11] has used difunctional relations in the setting of effect analyses. Difunctionality covers all our examples except distance-indexed types. Note that for both PERs and difunctional relations we need to close the relational interpretation of existential types under the appropriate property to ensure that all types are interpreted as PERs/difunctional relations. For distance-indexed types it is possible that a new notion of equivalence based on closeness is required.
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