
A PROGRAMMING LANGUAGE COMBINING QUANTUM AND CLASSICAL CONTROL

KINNARI DAVE ^{a,b}, LOUIS LEMONNIER ^c, ROMAIN PÉCHOUX ^b, AND VLADIMIR ZAMDZHEV ^a

^a Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, ENS Paris-Saclay, Inria, Laboratoire Méthodes Formelles, 91190, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

^b Université de Lorraine, CNRS, Inria, LORIA, F-54000 Nancy, France

^c University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT. The two main notions of control in quantum programming languages are often referred to as “quantum” control and “classical” control. With the latter, the control flow is based on classical information, potentially resulting from a quantum measurement, and this paradigm is well-suited to mixed state quantum computation. Whereas with quantum control, we are primarily focused on pure quantum computation and there the “control” is based on superposition. The two paradigms have not mixed well traditionally and they are almost always treated separately. In this work, we show that the paradigms may be combined within the same system. The key ingredients for achieving this are: (1) syntactically: a modality for incorporating pure quantum types into a mixed state quantum type system; (2) operationally: an adaptation of the notion of “quantum configuration” from quantum lambda-calculi, where the quantum data is replaced with pure quantum primitives; (3) denotationally: suitable (sub)categories of Hilbert spaces, for pure computation and von Neumann algebras, for mixed state computation in the Heisenberg picture of quantum mechanics.

1. INTRODUCTION

There are two important paradigms in the design of quantum programming languages – “classical control” and “quantum control”. In the classical control approach (e.g., [Sel04, SV⁺09, SV06, CW16, PPRZ20, JKL⁺22]) the control flow of a program is conditioned on classical information that may result from quantum measurements. Type systems for quantum programming languages that are based on classical control are able to represent a variety of effects, e.g., quantum state preparation, state evolution through the application of unitary operators, and probabilistic effects induced by quantum measurements. Because of this, it is natural to conceptualise such lambda-calculi using quantum structures and models that are suited to describing mixed-state quantum computation and information (e.g., density matrices, superoperators). In the quantum control approach (e.g., [SVV18, DCGMV19, DCM22, AM22, Val22]), one usually places an emphasis on pure state quantum computation and more specifically on superposition of terms, pure quantum states and unitary operators. In approaches that utilise classical control, one often starts with a selection of constants that represent some unitary operators (e.g., Hadamard, CNOT) and more complex unitary




FIGURE 1. A program and the corresponding circuit

operations can be described in a circuit-like fashion by composing the atomic unitaries in a suitable way. Whereas in the quantum control approach, unitary operators are defined through more fundamental primitives that do not require the programmer to specify a circuit-like decomposition of the unitary operation. Because of this, a considerable economy in terms of syntax can be achieved with quantum control. For example, consider the circuit in Figure 1. It uses the well-known *Toffoli* gate, which would have to be decomposed as a large circuit like the one in the figure. However, the program representing this circuit can instead be written as a simple lambda term in our language given in Figure 1, where $\text{Tof} \triangleq \mathcal{B}(\text{ctrl CNOT})$. To highlight this further note that the controlled Hadamard can be defined similarly to the Toffoli in our language, but a typical classically controlled quantum programming language would require two H gates, six T gates and one CNOT gate. Thus, our language offers an ease of writing programs by abstracting away quantum circuits. We aim to shift focus from drawing quantum circuits, which is a more *low-level* approach to writing code, to writing programs directly using syntax, which is a more *high-level* approach. In classical (non-quantum) programming, we can use high-level languages to write algorithms without having to specify boolean circuits or to encode integers using tuples of bits/booleans. With our paper, we are trying to advance quantum programming abstractions towards such a direction. For example, an individual qnat $|n\rangle$ can be used instead of a tensor of qubits $|q_1 q_2 \dots q_k\rangle$ whose binary encoding corresponds to n . We view boolean circuits and binary encodings of integers as low-level and likewise for their quantum counterparts. Our aim is to develop higher-level quantum abstractions.

Our Contributions. Because of the potential presence of quantum entanglement, it is impossible (in general) to decompose a quantum state into a non-trivial tensor product of two smaller quantum states. Indeed, in the quantum lambda-calculus (QLC) [PSV14], which is based on classical control, the type **qbit** of qubits is an opaque type in the sense that there are no *closed* values of such a type. Program states may be described via *quantum configurations* which are triples $(|\psi\rangle, \ell, M)$, where $|\psi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{2^n}$ is a *pure* quantum state (possibly entangled); M is a program possibly containing free variables of type **qbit**; ℓ is a *linking* function that maps the free quantum variables of M to appropriate components of the state $|\psi\rangle$. It is possible to also view ℓ as a unitary permutation acting on $|\psi\rangle$ and this view is important for our development. Such configurations, even though they are not part of the user-facing syntax, allow us to reason about entangled states and the operational semantics are described via a relation $(|\psi\rangle, \ell, M) \rightarrow_p (|\psi'\rangle, \ell', M')$, with p the probability of reduction.

The main idea that allows us to combine both quantum and classical control is to modify the quantum configurations described above by replacing the quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ with a suitable *pure quantum term* \mathbf{t} and to replace the linking function ℓ with a suitable *unitary permutation* u_σ , where both \mathbf{t} and u_σ are syntactic constructs from our pure quantum language that may be assigned types.

In order to accurately model the situation with the QLC, the term \mathbf{t} has to correspond to a *normalised* vector and we replace the unitary constants from the QLC with programmable unitary constructs, so the pure subsystem also has to ensure their *unitarity*. Our pure subsystem is based on ideas described in [Cha23, SVV18], but we further build on this by introducing an *equational theory* for our pure subsystem, which has unique normal forms and we describe a *denotational semantics* for it that is *sound and complete* with respect to the equational theory.

Next, we integrate the pure quantum subsystem into our main calculus, which allows us to describe both quantum and classical information and, therefore also classical control. This is a variant of the QLC with the addition of a modality $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q})$ which allows us to view pure quantum types \mathbf{Q} as types of mixed state quantum operations in the Heisenberg picture. The intuition behind this is the following: mixed states in the Schrödinger picture can be seen as CPTP maps¹ $(1 \mapsto \rho): \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(H)$ whereas mixed states in the Heisenberg picture are given by functionals of the form $\text{tr}(\rho-): \mathcal{B}(H) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, both of which are determined by a choice of density operator $\rho: H \rightarrow H$ (see [Cho14, Section 7] for detail on this matter). This modality allows us to replace the *constants* for state preparation and unitaries acting on qubits in the QLC with *terms and expressions* from the pure subsystem acting on more general quantum types beyond qubits. The operational semantics are described via a suitable adaptation of the aforementioned quantum configurations. The denotational semantics follows previous work on quantum programming semantics based on von Neumann algebras [CW16, PPRZ20, JKL⁺22] and we show, in addition, that the assignment $\mathcal{B}(-)$ may be extended to a strict monoidal functor (between the relevant categories of Hilbert spaces and von Neumann algebras) that is crucial for our denotational semantics.

Overall, the two main contributions of our work are: (1) we show that quantum and classical control can be combined in a syntactic, operational and denotational sense by integrating a pure quantum control subsystem as part of the meta-theory and syntax of a quantum lambda-calculus; (2) an equational theory for a (sub)system for quantum control with unique normal forms and a sound and complete denotational semantics. Some supplementary material including extra examples, proofs, and complete figures for formation rule predicates are provided in Appendix.

Related Work. We begin by commenting on semantic approaches to classical control. In [PSV14], the authors describe a QLC where the higher-order primitives are interpreted using techniques from the semantics of quantitative models of linear logic. In [CdVW19, CdV20, dV20], the author(s) work with QLCs whose denotational semantics is given via game semantics. More recently, in [TA24], the authors have shown how to interpret a QLC

¹CPTP stands for ‘completely positive trace preserving’ and $\mathcal{T}(H)$ and $\mathcal{B}(H)$ stand for the trace-class and bounded linear operators, respectively, on a Hilbert space H .

| | Our work | Qunity [VLRH23] | $\lambda\text{-}\mathcal{S}_1$ [DCGMV19, DCM22, AM22, DM22, AD17] | Sym [SVV18] | Quipper [GLR ⁺ 13] | QWIRE [PRZ17] | Q. λ -calculus | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|--------------------|--|----------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------|
| | | | | | | | [PSV14] | [CdVW19, CdV20, dV20] | [TA24] |
| Quantum control | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ | ✗ | ✗ | ✗ |
| Classical control | ✓ | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Infinite dimensional quantum type | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Unitary function spaces | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ | ✓ | ✗ | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ | ✗ |
| Normalised quantum terms | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ | ✗ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Denotational semantics | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Adequacy | ✓ | ✗ | ✓ | ✗ | ✗ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Termination | ✓ | ✗ | ✓ | ✓ | ✗* | ✓ | ✗* | ✗* | ✗* |

FIGURE 2. A comparison of some quantum programming languages.

with recursive types using presheaves that are enriched over a suitable base category and they also prove full abstraction. The approach that we use in this paper is based on von Neumann algebras which have been previously used for the semantics of quantum programming languages [CW16, JKL⁺22, PPRZ20]. In particular, if we disregard the interaction between the pure subsystem and the main calculus, then our denotational model for the main calculus coincides with the one in [CW16]. The reason that we choose von Neumann algebras over the other approaches is because we think this gives the model which is the closest to mathematical physics out of the ones mentioned. Furthermore, our primary focus is not on developing the semantics of the classical paradigm; instead it is on the *interaction* between the pure quantum control subsystem and the main calculus based on classical control. Another distinguishing feature of our system, compared to the ones above, is the addition of types such as $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{qnat})$ which allow us to describe states in infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, such as $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$, and which we do not think can be easily included using the other approaches. For the quantum control paradigm, relevant work includes [DCGMV19, DCM22, AM22, DM22, AD17]. What all these approaches have in common is that they have specific terms in their syntax for representing superposition. However, these approaches do not ensure unitarity of the relevant function spaces, in general. Our approach, instead, is based on related work first described in [SVV18] and then later in [Cha23]. One of the most distinctive features of this approach to quantum control is that the terms that introduce superposition are subject to strict formation conditions that ensure (linear algebraic) normalisation of the corresponding vectors. Furthermore, this approach to quantum control also imposes strict admissibility criteria on the unitary function spaces that can be formed through the type system and this ensures unitarity of the relevant expressions. Because of these considerations, we choose this approach to model quantum control in our pure subsystem. However, we have made some changes, in particular, we replace the operational semantics from these works with an equational theory instead. This works better for our approach to *combining* quantum and classical

* These languages admit general recursion.

control within the quantum configurations (in QLCs the quantum data is considered modulo equality). We continue building on this development by describing a denotational semantics that is sound and complete with respect to the equational theory. This is the first such result for languages with quantum control.

Another paper which combines quantum and classical control is Qunity [VLRH23]. However, compared to our work, Qunity does not have an operational semantics, but instead there is a compilation procedure to quantum circuits. Furthermore, the denotational semantics of Qunity: (1) does not ensure unitarity and normalisation of the pure primitives in its language, whereas ours does; (2) does not ensure trace-preservation of the mixed primitives in the Schrödinger picture, whereas ours does indeed ensure unitarity of the mixed primitives in the Heisenberg picture (which corresponds to trace-preservation under the Heisenberg-Schrödinger duality). Other differences include that Qunity is restricted to finite-dimensional quantum data and they do not have higher-order lambda abstractions for dealing with mixed-state primitives. Instead, Qunity relies on a try-catch mechanism to combine quantum and classical control, whereas our approach is based on quantum configurations. The table in Figure 2 gives a comparison of our work with other quantum programming languages. *Normalised quantum terms* refers to the property that terms representing pure/mixed quantum states always correspond to complex vectors with norm one/density operators with trace one. *Adequacy* refers to the property that two observationally distinct programs have distinct denotational interpretations.

Conference paper. This is an extended version of a paper [DLPZ25] published in the proceedings of FoSSaCS’25. Compared to the conference paper, the syntax of quantum control is more detailed, with full typing rules and definition of substitution. We also added details about the denotational semantics as unitaries and isometries between separable Hilbert spaces, which is now fully worked out with all the proofs. All the elements around the equational theory are also added. Finally, the proof of completeness is incorporated into the text. Furthermore, similarly to quantum control, the proofs for the fully-fledged syntax have been added, with a more detailed discussion on the denotational semantics in von Neumann algebras.

2. QUANTUM CONTROL

This section mainly consists of work completed in one of the authors’ PhD thesis [Lem24, Chapter 3], with notations adapted to this paper.

2.1. The Language of Quantum Control. We start by describing in details the language of (simply-typed) quantum control. We first lay out the syntax §2.1.1, then set forth the associated typing rules §2.1.2, before detailing out substitution works within this language §2.1.3.

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| (<i>Ground quantum types</i>) | $Q_1, Q_2 ::= I \mid Q_1 \oplus Q_2 \mid Q_1 \otimes Q_2 \mid \mathbf{qnat}$ |
| (<i>Unitary types</i>) | $U ::= U(Q_1, Q_2)$ |
| (<i>Basis Values</i>) | $b ::= * \mid x \mid \mathbf{inl} \, b \mid \mathbf{inr} \, b \mid b \otimes b \mid 0 \mid S \, b$ |
| (<i>Values</i>) | $v ::= \sum_{i \in I} (\alpha_i \cdot b_i)$ |
| (<i>Expressions</i>) | $e ::= * \mid x \mid \mathbf{inl} \, e \mid \mathbf{inr} \, e \mid e \otimes e \mid 0 \mid S \, e$ $\mid \sum_{i \in I} (\alpha_i \cdot e_i)$ |
| (<i>Unitaries</i>) | $u ::= \{ \mid b_1 \mapsto e_1 \dots \mid b_n \mapsto e_n \}$ $\mid u \otimes u \mid u \oplus u \mid u \circ u \mid u^* \mid \text{ctrl} \, u$ |
| (<i>Terms</i>) | $t ::= * \mid x \mid \mathbf{inl} \, t \mid \mathbf{inr} \, t \mid t \otimes t \mid 0 \mid S \, t$ $\mid u \, t \mid \sum_{i \in I} (\alpha_i \cdot t_i)$ |

FIGURE 3. Syntax of quantum control.

2.1.1. *Syntax.* The syntax of the programming language studied in this section is described in a usual way, with grammars given in Figure 3. The ground types are given by a unit type I and the usual connectives \oplus and \otimes , which are respectively called *direct sum* and *tensor product*. We also have the inductive type \mathbf{qnat} , as a witness that it is possible to work with non finite data types, and thus non finite-dimensional spaces in the model. We interpret every quantum type as a separable Hilbert space: the unit type is interpreted as $\llbracket I \rrbracket \triangleq \mathbb{C}$; pair types are interpreted as tensor products; (quantum) sum types are interpreted as direct sums; finally, $\llbracket \mathbf{qnat} \rrbracket \triangleq \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$. The type of qubits may be defined as $\mathbf{qbit} \triangleq I \oplus I$. We write \mathbf{qbit}^n for the n -fold tensor product $\mathbf{qbit} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{qbit}$. The Hilbert space $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ allows us to form superpositions with respect to a countable orthonormal basis (e.g., $1/\sqrt{2} |3\rangle + 1/\sqrt{2} |7\rangle$). We may think of $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ as a quantum analogue of the natural numbers, to abstract from qubit-level computation. We equip functions, called *unitaries* in this section, with a separate type, written $U(Q_1, Q_2)$ when Q_1 and Q_2 are two ground types. They are not interpreted as Hilbert spaces, but as sets of unitary operators: $\llbracket U(Q_1, Q_2) \rrbracket \triangleq \{u : \llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket \mid u \text{ is a unitary operator}\}$.

The terms of the language are given as follows:

- variables x, y, z, \dots , given as elements of a set of variables \mathbf{Var} , assumed totally ordered;
- a term $*$ called the *unit* corresponding to the unit type I ;
- usual connectives for the direct sum, \mathbf{inl} and \mathbf{inr} which are respectively called the *left injector* and *right injector*;
- a connective corresponding to the tensor product, that is also written \otimes ;
- terms for natural numbers, 0 and the connective S that gives the successor of a term;
- the application of a unitary to a term, written $u \, t$ when u is a unitary and t a term;
- finally, given a set of indices I , which is assumed totally ordered, a family of complex numbers $(\alpha_i)_{i \in I}$ and a family of terms $(t_i)_{i \in I}$, one can form the term $\sum_{i \in I} (\alpha_i \cdot t_i)$, representing the linear combination of the terms with complex scalars. This last term construction embodies the quantum effect of the language.

In quantum theory, a linear combination of vectors $\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i |x_i\rangle$ is normalised if $\sum_{i \in I} |\alpha_i|^2 = 1$. The family of real numbers $(|\alpha_i|^2)_{i \in I}$ is then seen as a probability distribution. This work does not focus on the probabilistic aspect of quantum theory; however, we want to work with well-formed states, and thus normalised states. This is why we ensure later that a linear combination of terms is normalised. Throughout the section, a term $\sum_{i \in \{1,2\}} (\alpha_i \cdot \mathbf{t}_i)$ might be written $\alpha_1 \cdot \mathbf{t}_1 + \alpha_2 \cdot \mathbf{t}_2$, regarded as syntactic sugar. In some examples, a term $\sum_{i \in \{*\}} 1 \cdot \mathbf{t}$ can be written $1 \cdot \mathbf{t}$ or even \mathbf{t} for readability; but note that $\sum_{i \in \{*\}} 1 \cdot \mathbf{t}$ and \mathbf{t} are different terms in the syntax.

We call *basis values*, the terms that are unitary-free – in the sense that they do not contain any function application – and that do not involve linear combinations. These terms are naturally classical. Their name comes from the fact that we use them as a syntactic representation of the canonical basis of a Hilbert space. Note that basis values can be totally ordered.

Values, on the other hand, are linear combinations of basis values. In a value $\sum_{i \in I} (\alpha_i \cdot \mathbf{b}_i)$, we assume that the family $(\mathbf{b}_i)_{i \in I}$ is an increasing sequence, and that none of the scalars is equal to 0; this allows us to work with unique normal forms later in the section. Since this definition is restrictive, we need to introduce a more general piece of syntax, which still does not include unitary application, called an *expression*. They are used as outputs of functions, that we introduce below.

Example 2.1. The basis term $\ast : \mathbf{I}$ represents the complex scalar $1 \in \mathbb{C}$. The basis terms that represent the computational basis for qubits can be defined by $|\mathbf{0}\rangle \triangleq \mathbf{inl} \ast : \mathbf{qbit}$ and $|\mathbf{1}\rangle \triangleq \mathbf{inr} \ast : \mathbf{qbit}$. Other basis terms that can be defined include $|\mathbf{00}\rangle \triangleq |\mathbf{0}\rangle \otimes |\mathbf{0}\rangle : \mathbf{qbit}^2$ and $|\mathbf{11}\rangle \triangleq |\mathbf{1}\rangle \otimes |\mathbf{1}\rangle : \mathbf{qbit}^2$. If \mathbf{b} is a basis term, we often write it as $|\mathbf{b}\rangle$ to distinguish it from other (non-basis) terms, e.g., $|\mathbf{2}\rangle : \mathbf{qnat}$ represents the qnat $|2\rangle \in \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$. Single-qubit states may be defined by $|\pm\rangle \triangleq (1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |\mathbf{0}\rangle \pm 1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |\mathbf{1}\rangle) : \mathbf{qbit}$. and (Entangled) quantum states can be defined, e.g., $\mathbf{Bell} \triangleq (1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |\mathbf{00}\rangle + 1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |\mathbf{11}\rangle) : \mathbf{qbit}^2$. Linear combinations of qnats can also be written in the language, *i.e.* $(1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |\mathbf{0}\rangle + 1/\sqrt{6} \cdot |\mathbf{1}\rangle + 1/\sqrt{3} \cdot |\mathbf{2}\rangle) : \mathbf{qnat}$.

Next, we describe the unitaries u of Figure 3. *Unitary pattern-matching*, whose syntax is given by $\{ | \mathbf{b}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{e}_1 \dots | \mathbf{b}_n \mapsto \mathbf{e}_n \}$, allows us to build unitary maps out of basis terms and values: every *closed* basis term \mathbf{b}_i is mapped to the closed value \mathbf{v}_i ; basis terms with free variables \mathbf{b}_i determine a mapping with the use of substitution with respect to the corresponding value \mathbf{v}_i , wherein both \mathbf{b}_i and \mathbf{v}_i have the same free variables occurring within them, and the induced mapping is determined by performing all possible substitutions of the free variables on both sides with the same closed basis terms. The formation conditions (see §2.1.2) ensure that the basis terms \mathbf{b}_i (resp. values \mathbf{v}_i) determine an ONB for the type \mathbf{Q}_1 (resp. \mathbf{Q}_2) and therefore $\{ | \mathbf{b}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{e}_1 \dots | \mathbf{b}_n \mapsto \mathbf{e}_n \}$ determines a unitary map. We introduce syntactic sugar for quantum if statements, written **qif**. If u_1 is of the form $\{ | \mathbf{b}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{e}_1 \dots | \mathbf{b}_n \mapsto \mathbf{e}_n \}$ and u_2 of the form $\{ | \mathbf{b}'_1 \mapsto \mathbf{e}'_1 \dots | \mathbf{b}'_m \mapsto \mathbf{e}'_m \}$ then **qif** x **then** $x \otimes u_2$ **else** $x \otimes u_1$ is short for the unitary:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} |\mathbf{0}\rangle \otimes \mathbf{b}_1 \mapsto |\mathbf{0}\rangle \otimes \mathbf{v}_1 & |\mathbf{1}\rangle \otimes \mathbf{b}'_1 \mapsto |\mathbf{1}\rangle \otimes \mathbf{v}'_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ |\mathbf{0}\rangle \otimes \mathbf{b}_n \mapsto |\mathbf{0}\rangle \otimes \mathbf{v}_n & |\mathbf{1}\rangle \otimes \mathbf{b}'_m \mapsto |\mathbf{1}\rangle \otimes \mathbf{v}'_m \end{array} \right\}$$

Example 2.2. The unitaries Had and CNOT below encode the standard Hadamard and CNOT gates, respectively. CNOT makes use of some simple pattern-matching on its last

line: it can match either with $|0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle$ or with $|0\rangle \otimes |1\rangle$. The unitary Had_{qnat} defines an extension of the Hadamard gate on the space $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Had} &: U(\text{qbit}, \text{qbit}) & \text{CNOT} &: U(\text{qbit}^2, \text{qbit}^2) \\ \text{Had} &\triangleq \left\{ \begin{array}{l} |0\rangle \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot |0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot |1\rangle \\ |1\rangle \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot |0\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot |1\rangle \end{array} \right\} & \text{CNOT} &\triangleq \left\{ \begin{array}{l} |1\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \mapsto |1\rangle \otimes |1\rangle \\ |1\rangle \otimes |1\rangle \mapsto |1\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \\ |0\rangle \otimes |x\rangle \mapsto |0\rangle \otimes |x\rangle \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Had}_{\text{qnat}} &: U(\text{qnat}, \text{qnat}) \\ \text{Had}_{\text{qnat}} &\triangleq \left\{ \begin{array}{l} |0\rangle \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot |0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot |1\rangle \\ |1\rangle \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot |0\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot |1\rangle \\ |x+2\rangle \mapsto |x+2\rangle \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

The remaining expressions for forming unitaries are easy to understand: $u_2 \circ u_1$ represents composition of unitaries, u^* represents the adjoint of a unitary, $u_1 \otimes u_2$ and $u_1 \oplus u_2$ represent tensor products and direct sums of unitaries, and finally, $\text{ctrl } u$ represents a qubit-controlled unitary operator. For simplicity, we sometimes write $\{\dots | \mathbf{b}_i \mapsto \mathbf{e}_i \dots\}$ as a shorthand notation for the unitary $\{ | \mathbf{b}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{e}_1 \dots | \mathbf{b}_n \mapsto \mathbf{e}_n \}$, when n is clear from context or unimportant. We also point out that unitaries depend only on values and basis terms and that general pure terms cannot be used for the construction of unitaries.

2.1.2. Types and Formation Rules. As usual, a *typing context* consist of a set of pairs of a variable and a type, written Γ and generated over $\Gamma ::= \emptyset \mid \{ \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{Q} \} \cup \Gamma$. A comma between two contexts represents the union of the contexts, *i.e.* $\Gamma, \Gamma' = \Gamma \cup \Gamma'$. We have two levels of judgements: the one for terms, where sequents are written $\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{Q}_1$ and a typing judgement for unitaries, noted $\Vdash u : U(\mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2)$. Variables in a context Γ are strictly linear: given $\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{Q}_1$, every element of Γ has to occur *exactly once* in the term \mathbf{t} .

Values (resp. expressions, terms) in the language are, in general, normalised linear combinations of basis values (resp. expressions, terms). However, not all basis values (resp. expressions, terms) can be summed in a normalised combination. If that statement is not convincing, the next example will help.

Example 2.3. $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot (\text{inl } *) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot (\text{inl } *)$ should not be considered a quantum state: its norm is $\sqrt{2}$, not 1. Its interpretation in Hilbert spaces is the following: $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle = \sqrt{2} |0\rangle$. This is not a normalised state.

The next definition introduces the predicate of orthogonality, written \perp . Given $\mathbf{t}_1 \perp \mathbf{t}_2$, we are allowed to form a normalised linear combination of the two terms.

Definition 2.4 (Orthogonality). We introduce a symmetric binary relation \perp on terms. Given two terms $\mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2$, $\mathbf{t}_1 \perp \mathbf{t}_2$ holds if it can be derived inductively with the rules below; we say that \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 are orthogonal. The relation \perp is defined as the smallest symmetric

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\emptyset \vdash * : I}, \quad \frac{}{x : Q \vdash x : Q}, \quad \frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 : Q_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash e_2 : Q_2}{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash e_1 \otimes e_2 : Q_1 \otimes Q_2}, \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e : Q_1}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{inl} \, e : Q_1 \oplus Q_2}, \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e : Q_2}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{inr} \, e : Q_1 \oplus Q_2}, \\
\frac{}{\vdash 0 : \mathbf{qnat}}, \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash e : \mathbf{qnat}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{S} \, e : \mathbf{qnat}}, \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_i : Q \quad \sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 = 1 \quad \forall i \neq j, e_i \perp e_j}{\Gamma \vdash \sum_i (\alpha_i \cdot e_i) : Q}.
\end{array}$$

FIGURE 4. Formation rules of (basis) values and expressions.

relation such that:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\mathbf{inl} \, t_1 \perp \mathbf{inr} \, t_2} \quad \frac{}{0 \perp \mathbf{S} \, t} \quad \frac{t_1 \perp t_2}{\mathbf{S} \, t_1 \perp \mathbf{S} \, t_2} \quad \frac{t_1 \perp t_2}{t \otimes t_1 \perp t' \otimes t_2} \quad \frac{t_1 \perp t_2}{t_1 \otimes t \perp t_2 \otimes t'} \\
\frac{t_1 \perp t_2}{\mathbf{inl} \, t_1 \perp \mathbf{inl} \, t_2} \quad \frac{t_1 \perp t_2}{\mathbf{inr} \, t_1 \perp \mathbf{inr} \, t_2} \quad \frac{t_1 \perp t_2}{u \, t_1 \perp u \, t_2} \quad \frac{\forall i \in I, t \perp t_i}{t \perp \sum_{i \in I} (\alpha_i \cdot t_i)} \\
\frac{\forall i \in I, t \perp t_i \quad \alpha_* = 0 \quad t_* = t}{t \perp \sum_{i \in I \cup \{*\}} (\alpha_i \cdot t_i)} \quad \frac{\forall i \neq j \in I, t_i \perp t_j \quad J, K \subseteq I \quad \sum_{i \in J \cap K} \bar{\alpha}_i \beta_i = 0}{\sum_{j \in J} (\alpha_j \cdot t_j) \perp \sum_{k \in K} (\beta_k \cdot t_k)}
\end{array}$$

Remark 2.5 (Orthogonality of variables). Given two variables x and y , the terms x and y are not orthogonal. The main reason is that they could be instantiated with the same value. On the other hand, $\mathbf{inl} \, x$ and $\mathbf{inr} \, y$ are orthogonal, for example.

Remark 2.6. Consider the following unitary:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{inl} \, x \mapsto \mathbf{inr} \, x \\ \mathbf{inr} \, y \mapsto \mathbf{inl} \, y \end{array} \right\}$$

which swaps the two sides of a direct sum \oplus and call this unitary u . Applying u to $\mathbf{inl} \, *$ for example, we get $\mathbf{inr} \, *$, which is orthogonal to $\mathbf{inl} \, *$. However, we cannot derive that $u(\mathbf{inl} \, *)$ and $\mathbf{inl} \, *$ are orthogonal with the rules given above. This is because we wish to be able to derive orthogonal *statically*.

Note that orthogonality holds without any formation rules or notion of type. Figure 4 introduces the formation rules for expressions, and therefore for basis values and values, thanks to the notion of orthogonality.

Once we know how basis values are formed in a certain type, we can discuss some orthogonality properties among specific types. In linear algebra, given a vector space and an orthogonal basis of that space, if two elements of the basis are not orthogonal, then they are equal. Our case is more subtle, because, for example, $\mathbf{inr} \, (\mathbf{inl} \, *)$ and $\mathbf{inr} \, x$ are not equal, but also not orthogonal. We will see, later in this section, that they are linked by substitution.

Lemma 2.7. *Given well-formed basis values $\Gamma_1 \vdash \mathbf{b}_1 : Q_1$, $\Gamma_2 \vdash \mathbf{b}_2 : Q_1$ and $\Gamma_3 \vdash \mathbf{b}_3 : Q_1$, if $\mathbf{b}_1 \perp \mathbf{b}_2$ and $\neg(\mathbf{b}_2 \perp \mathbf{b}_3)$, then $\mathbf{b}_1 \perp \mathbf{b}_3$.*

Of course, this lemma holds for basis values because they belong to a common basis, that can be seen as the *canonical basis*. Nothing can be said about the orthogonality of values that do not belong to a common basis.

Example 2.8. The values $\mathbf{inl} *$ and $\mathbf{inr} *$ are orthogonal, but of course, they are both not orthogonal to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot (\mathbf{inl} *) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot (\mathbf{inr} *)$.

This motivates a syntactic definition for a basis, containing values of the language. Given a set of orthogonal values, we want to ensure that this set parses the whole type, so that it can be seen as an orthonormal basis. This is given by the notion of *orthogonal decomposition*. First, given a set $S = \{\mathbf{b}_1 \otimes \mathbf{b}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n \otimes \mathbf{b}'_n\}$, we define $\pi_1(S) = \{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n\}$ and $\pi_2(S) = \{\mathbf{b}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}'_n\}$. Finally, we define S_b^1 and S_b^2 respectively as $\{\mathbf{b}' \mid \mathbf{b} \otimes \mathbf{b}' \in S\}$ and $\{\mathbf{b}' \mid \mathbf{b}' \otimes \mathbf{b} \in S\}$.

Definition 2.9 (Orthonormal Basis). We introduce a predicate $\text{ONB}_Q(-)$ on finite sets of basis values. Given a finite set of values S , $\text{ONB}_{Q_1} S_b$ holds if it can be derived with the following rules. The predicate is defined inductively as the smallest predicate such that:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{}{\text{ONB}_Q(\{\mathbf{x}\})} \quad \frac{}{\text{ONB}_I(\{*\})} \quad \frac{\text{ONB}_{Q_1} S \quad \text{ONB}_{Q_2} T}{\text{ONB}_{Q_1 \oplus Q_2}(\{\mathbf{inl} \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{b} \in S\} \cup \{\mathbf{inr} \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{b} \in T\})} \\
 \frac{\text{ONB}_{\mathbf{qnat}} S}{\text{ONB}_{\mathbf{qnat}}(\{\mathbf{0}\} \cup \{\mathbf{S} \mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{v} \in S\})} \quad \frac{\text{ONB}_{Q_2}(\pi_2(S)) \text{ and } \forall \mathbf{b} \in \pi_2(S), \text{ONB}_{Q_1}(S_b^2)}{\text{ONB}_{Q_1 \otimes Q_2} S} \\
 \frac{\text{ONB}_{Q_1}(\pi_1(S)) \text{ and } \forall \mathbf{b} \in \pi_1(S), \text{ONB}_{Q_2}(S_b^1)}{\text{ONB}_{Q_1 \otimes Q_2} S}
 \end{array}$$

The existence of this predicate is ensured by induction on the cardinal of S .

To simplify the notations in later proofs, we will write $S \boxplus T$ for the set $\{\mathbf{inl} \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{b} \in S\} \cup \{\mathbf{inr} \mathbf{b} \mid \mathbf{b} \in T\}$, and $S^{\oplus 0}$ for the set $\{\mathbf{0}\} \cup \{\mathbf{S} \mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{v} \in S\}$. We adopt functional programming convention regarding parentheses: when readable, we write $\text{ONB}_Q S$ instead of $\text{ONB}_Q(S)$. Also, we call ONB the predicate introduced above in general, without precision of type, to facilitate the later discussions.

Remark 2.10. Note that the precondition to derive $\text{ONB}_{Q_1 \otimes Q_2} S$ cannot be simplified: there are sets S such that $\text{ONB}_{Q_1}(\pi_1(S))$ and for all $\mathbf{b} \in \pi_1(S)$, $\text{ONB}_{Q_2}(S_b^1)$ but not all $\mathbf{b} \in \pi_2(S)$ is such that $\text{ONB}_{Q_2}(S_b^2)$, e.g. $S = \{(\mathbf{inl} *) \otimes \mathbf{y}, (\mathbf{inr} \mathbf{x}) \otimes (\mathbf{inl} *), (\mathbf{inr} \mathbf{x}) \otimes (\mathbf{inr} *)\}$ with the type $(I \oplus (I \oplus I)) \otimes (I \otimes I)$.

The predicate ONB_Q defined above ensures that a finite set S of values represents an orthonormal basis of Q , that we can view as the canonical basis. Note that even for \mathbf{qnat} , the set representing the basis is finite, e.g. $\{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{S} \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{S} \mathbf{x})\}$. With knowledge of linear algebra, one can say that the bases secured by ONB are not all the possible orthonormal bases. A change of basis with a unitary matrix also provides an orthonormal basis. This is the purpose of the next definition.

Definition 2.11. We extend the previous definition to general values. The statement $\text{ONB}^e_Q(-)$ is a predicate on finite sets of values, and $\text{ONB}^e_Q S$ holds if it can be derived

from the following rule.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\overline{\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1}(\{x\})} \quad \overline{\text{ONB}^e_I(\{*\})}}{\text{ONB}^e_{\text{qnat}}(\{\mathbf{0}\} \cup \{\mathbf{S} v \mid v \in S\})} \quad \frac{\overline{\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1 \oplus Q_2}(\{\text{inl } e \mid e \in S\} \cup \{\text{inr } e \mid e \in T\})}}{\text{ONB}^e_{Q_2}(\pi_2(S)) \text{ and } \forall e \in \pi_2(S), \text{ONB}^e_{Q_1}(S_e^2)} \\
\frac{\text{ONB}^e_{\text{qnat}} S}{\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1 \otimes Q_2} S} \quad \frac{\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1}(\pi_1(S)) \text{ and } \forall e \in \pi_1(S), \text{ONB}^e_{Q_2}(S_e^1)}{\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1 \otimes Q_2} S} \\
\frac{\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1} S \quad (\alpha_{e,e'})_{(e,e') \in S \times S} \text{ is a unitary matrix}}{\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1}(\{\Sigma_{e' \in S}(\alpha_{e,e'} \cdot e') \mid e \in S\})}
\end{array}$$

Given $\text{ONB}^e_Q S$, we say that S is an *orthogonal decomposition* of type Q .

To simplify the notations, we will write S^α the set $\{\Sigma_{b' \in S}(\alpha_{b,b'} \cdot b') \mid b \in S\}$.

Example 2.12. For **qbit**, the rules from Definitions 2.9 and 2.11 show that $\text{ONB}_{\text{qbit}}(\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\})$ and that $\text{ONB}^e_{\text{qbit}}(\{|+\rangle, |-\rangle\})$ hold (with $|\pm\rangle$ defined in Example 2.1). We also have that $\text{ONB}_{\text{qbit}}(\{x\})$, where x is a variable. In other words, we determine an ONB for the type **qbit** by substituting x with all possible closed computational *basis* terms of type **qbit** (see Figure 3). For **qnat**, any set S with the property that $\text{ONB}_{\text{qnat}}(S)$ holds, must contain a term that is not closed. We have that $\text{ONB}_{\text{qnat}}(\{|x\rangle\})$, $\text{ONB}_{\text{qnat}}(\{|0\rangle, |x+1\rangle\})$, and $\text{ONB}_{\text{qnat}}(\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |x+2\rangle\})$ hold true and determine the same ONB for the type **qnat** (it represents the computational basis of $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$). The set used in the last predicate allows us to conclude that $\text{ONB}_{\text{qnat}}^{\text{val}}(\{1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |0\rangle + 1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |1\rangle, 1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |0\rangle - 1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |1\rangle, |x+2\rangle\})$ holds. This last set of values is used to type Had_{qnat} from Example 2.2.

We define the predicate ONB above without the help of the orthogonality predicate \perp , but they are not unrelated: the elements of an orthogonal decomposition, are in particular pairwise orthogonal.

Lemma 2.13 (ONB implies \perp). *Given $\text{ONB}^e_Q S$, for all $t_1 \neq t_2 \in S$, $t_1 \perp t_2$.*

Proof. The proof is done by induction on ONB.

- $\text{ONB}^e_Q \{x\}$. There is no pair of different terms in $\{x\}$.
- $\text{ONB}^e_I \{*\}$. There is no pair of different terms in $\{*\}$.
- $\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1 \oplus Q_2} S \boxplus T$. There are several cases: either both terms are of the form **inl** —, namely $t_1 = \text{inl } t'_1$ and $t_2 = \text{inl } t'_2$, with t'_1 and t'_2 in S , in which case the induction hypothesis on $\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1} S$ gives that $t'_1 \perp t'_2$, and thus $\text{inl } t'_1 \perp \text{inl } t'_2$; or both are of the form **inr** —, the case is similar with the induction hypothesis on $\text{ONB}^e_{Q_2} T$; or $t_1 = \text{inl } t'_1$ and $t_2 = \text{inr } t'_2$, then we have directly $\text{inl } t'_1 \perp \text{inr } t'_2$.
- $\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1 \otimes Q_2} S$. Both cases are similar. Suppose that $\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1} \pi_1(S)$. We know that $t_1 = t'_1 \otimes t''_1$ and $t_2 = t'_2 \otimes t''_2$. The induction hypothesis on $\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1} \pi_1(S)$ gives that $t'_1 \perp t'_2$ and thus $t'_1 \otimes t''_1 \perp t'_2 \otimes t''_2$.
- $\text{ONB}^e_{\text{qnat}} S^{\oplus 0}$. If one of t_1 or t_2 is $\mathbf{0}$, the conclusion is direct; else, $t_1 = \mathbf{S} t'_1$ and $t_2 = \mathbf{S} t'_2$ and the induction hypothesis on $\text{ONB}^e_{\text{qnat}} S$ gives that $t'_1 \perp t'_2$ and thus $\mathbf{S} t'_1 \perp \mathbf{S} t'_2$.
- $\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1} S^\alpha$. By induction hypothesis, all the terms in S are pairwise orthogonal; and the matrix α is unitary, which means that the inner product of its columns is zero when the columns are different, which ensures that two different terms in S^α are orthogonal.

□

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Gamma_i \vdash \mathbf{b}_i : \mathbf{Q}_1 \quad \text{ONB}_{\mathbf{Q}_1}\{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n\} \quad \Gamma_i \vdash \mathbf{e}_i : \mathbf{Q}_2 \quad \text{ONB}_{\mathbf{Q}_2}^e\{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n\}}{\vdash \{ \mid \mathbf{b}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{e}_1 \ \dots \mid \mathbf{b}_n \mapsto \mathbf{e}_n \} : U(\mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2),} \quad \frac{}{\vdash u : U(\mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2)} \\
\frac{}{\vdash u^* : U(\mathbf{Q}_2, \mathbf{Q}_1)}, \\
\frac{\vdash u_1 : U(\mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2) \quad \vdash u_2 : U(\mathbf{Q}_2, \mathbf{Q}_3)}{\vdash u_2 \circ u_1 : U(\mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_3)}, \quad \frac{\vdash u_1 : U(\mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2) \quad \vdash u_2 : U(\mathbf{Q}_3, \mathbf{Q}_4)}{\vdash u_1 \otimes u_2 : U(\mathbf{Q}_1 \otimes \mathbf{Q}_3, \mathbf{Q}_2 \otimes \mathbf{Q}_4)}, \\
\frac{\vdash u_1 : U(\mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2) \quad \vdash u_2 : U(\mathbf{Q}_3, \mathbf{Q}_4)}{\vdash u_1 \oplus u_2 : U(\mathbf{Q}_1 \oplus \mathbf{Q}_3, \mathbf{Q}_2 \oplus \mathbf{Q}_4)}, \quad \frac{\vdash u : U(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{Q})}{\vdash \text{ctrl } u : U(\mathbf{qbit} \otimes \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{qbit} \otimes \mathbf{Q})}.
\end{array}$$

FIGURE 5. Formation rules of unitaries.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\emptyset \vdash * : \mathbf{I}}, \quad \frac{}{x : \mathbf{Q} \vdash x : \mathbf{Q}}, \quad \frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash t_1 : \mathbf{Q}_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash t_2 : \mathbf{Q}_2}{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash t_1 \otimes t_2 : \mathbf{Q}_1 \otimes \mathbf{Q}_2}, \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \mathbf{Q}_1}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inl } t : \mathbf{Q}_1 \oplus \mathbf{Q}_2}, \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \mathbf{Q}_2}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inr } t : \mathbf{Q}_1 \oplus \mathbf{Q}_2}, \\
\frac{}{\vdash \mathbf{0} : \mathbf{qnat}}, \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t : \mathbf{qnat}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{S } t : \mathbf{qnat}}, \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_i : \mathbf{Q} \quad \sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 = 1 \quad \forall i \neq j, t_i \perp t_j}{\Gamma \vdash \sum_i (\alpha_i \cdot t_i) : \mathbf{Q}}, \quad \frac{\vdash u : U(\mathbf{Q}_1, \mathbf{Q}_2) \quad \Gamma \vdash t : \mathbf{Q}_1}{\Gamma \vdash u \ t : \mathbf{Q}_2}.
\end{array}$$

FIGURE 6. Formation rules of terms.

Note that while orthogonality ensure non-overlapping, it does not ensure exhaustivity, only $\text{ONB}_{\mathbf{Q}}$ does. The next lemma details the exhaustivity of $\text{ONB}_{\mathbf{Q}}$, and is a consequence of a later result, that uses the notion of substitution (see §2.1.3 and Lemma 2.69).

Proposition 2.14. *If $\text{ONB}_{\mathbf{Q}_1} S$ and $\Gamma \vdash e : \mathbf{Q}_1$, then there exists $e' \in S$ such that $\neg(e \perp e')$.*

This notion of orthogonal decomposition allows us to introduce *unitary* abstractions in our syntax. A basic unitary has the form $\{ \mid \mathbf{b}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{e}_1 \ \dots \mid \mathbf{b}_n \mapsto \mathbf{e}_n \}$ and is well-formed only if $(\mathbf{b}_i)_i$ forms a basis and $(\mathbf{e}_i)_i$ also forms a basis; we then retrieve the intuition that a unitary should be equivalent to a change of orthonormal basis. The typing rules for deriving unitaries and unitary operations are detailed in Figure 5.

Terms in our syntax are either expressions or an application of a unitary to a term, in a similar style to the λ -calculus; however, abstractions are considered separately in the grammar. The formation rules are the same as the one for values given in Figure 4, with the addition of a rule that enables the application of a unitary to a term. The details are in Figure 6.

The application of a unitary to a term is what carries the computational power of the language. In the λ -calculus, the β -reduction reduces an application to a term where a substitution is performed. A similar mechanism is at play in this syntax; however, the

left-hand side in a unitary abstraction can contain several variables. Hence the introduction of *valuations*, which we use to perform substitution and to define our equivalent of β -reduction.

2.1.3. Valuations and Substitution. We recall the formalisation proposed in [SVV18], with the notion of valuation: a partial map from a finite set of variables (the support) to a set of values. Given two basis values \mathbf{b} and \mathbf{b}' , we build the smallest valuation σ such that the patterns of \mathbf{b} and \mathbf{b}' match and that the application of the substitution to \mathbf{b} , written $\sigma(\mathbf{b})$, is equal to \mathbf{b}' . We denote the matching of a basis value \mathbf{b}' against a pattern \mathbf{b} and its associated valuation σ as $\text{match}(\sigma, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b}')$. Thus, $\text{match}(\sigma, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b}')$ means that \mathbf{b}' matches with \mathbf{b} and gives a smallest valuation σ , while $\sigma(\mathbf{b})$ is the substitution performed. The predicate $\text{match}(\sigma, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b}')$ it is defined as follows, with $\mathbf{inx} \mathbf{b}$ being either $\mathbf{inl} \mathbf{b}$ or $\mathbf{inr} \mathbf{b}$.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{}{\text{match}(\sigma, *, *)} \quad \frac{\sigma = \{x \mapsto b'\}}{\text{match}(\sigma, x, b')}}{\text{match}(\sigma, \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}'_1)} \quad \frac{\text{match}(\sigma, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b}')}{\text{match}(\sigma, \mathbf{inx} \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{inx} \mathbf{b}')} \quad \frac{\text{supp}(\sigma_1) \cap \text{supp}(\sigma_2) = \emptyset \quad \sigma = \sigma_1 \cup \sigma_2}{\text{match}(\sigma, \mathbf{b}_1 \otimes \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}'_1 \otimes \mathbf{b}'_2)} \quad \frac{\text{match}(\sigma, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b}')}{\text{match}(\sigma, \mathbf{S} \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{S} \mathbf{b}')} \quad \frac{}{\text{match}(\sigma, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})}$$

Besides basis values, we authorise valuations to replace variables with any expression, *e.g.* $\{x \mapsto e\}$. Whenever σ is a valuation whose support contains the variables of \mathbf{t} , we write $\sigma(\mathbf{t})$ for the value where the variables of \mathbf{t} have been replaced with the corresponding terms in σ , as follows:

- $\sigma(x) = e$ if $\{x \mapsto e\} \subseteq \sigma$,
- $\sigma(*) = *$,
- $\sigma(\mathbf{inl} \mathbf{t}) = \mathbf{inl} \sigma(\mathbf{t})$,
- $\sigma(\mathbf{inr} \mathbf{t}) = \mathbf{inr} \sigma(\mathbf{t})$,
- $\sigma(\mathbf{t}_1 \otimes \mathbf{t}_2) = \sigma(\mathbf{t}_1) \otimes \sigma(\mathbf{t}_2)$,
- $\sigma(\mathbf{S} \mathbf{t}) = \mathbf{S} \sigma(\mathbf{t})$,
- $\sigma(\Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \mathbf{t}_i)) = \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \sigma(\mathbf{t}_i))$,
- $\sigma(u \mathbf{t}) = u \sigma(\mathbf{t})$.

Remark 2.15. If $\text{match}(\sigma, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b}')$, then $\sigma(\mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{b}'$.

We can now show the soundness of orthogonality with regard to pattern-matching: in other words, orthogonality is stable by substitution, and thus the previous remark ensures there cannot be any match between two basis values if they are orthogonal.

Lemma 2.16. *Given two terms \mathbf{t}_1 and \mathbf{t}_2 , if $\mathbf{t}_1 \perp \mathbf{t}_2$, then for all valuations σ_1 and σ_2 , $\sigma_1(\mathbf{t}_1) \perp \sigma_2(\mathbf{t}_2)$.*

Proof. Observe that $\sigma_1(\mathbf{inl} \mathbf{t}_1) = \mathbf{inl} \sigma_1(\mathbf{t}_1)$ and $\sigma_2(\mathbf{inr} \mathbf{t}_2) = \mathbf{inr} \sigma_2(\mathbf{t}_2)$ and thus, whatever the valuations are, those two terms are orthogonal. The rest of the proof falls directly by induction on the definition of \perp . \square

If one the basis values is closed, we observe that there is an equivalence between matching the pattern and not being orthogonal; which also implies that different patterns are orthogonal.

Proposition 2.17. *Given two well-formed basis values $\Gamma \vdash b : Q$ and $\vdash b' : Q$, $\neg(b \perp b')$ iff there exists σ such that $\text{match}(\sigma, b, b')$.*

Proof. This is proven by a direct induction on $\Gamma \vdash b : Q$. □

The next two lemmas provide a strong link between orthogonal decompositions and substitutions.

Lemma 2.18 (Exhaustivity and non-overlapping). *Let $\text{ONB}_Q S$, then for all closed basis values $\vdash b' : Q$, there exists a unique $b \in S$ and a unique σ such that $\text{match}(\sigma, b, b')$.*

Proof. This is proven by induction on the derivation of $\text{ONB}_Q S$.

- If $\text{ONB}_Q \{x\}$. There is only x in S and $\{x \mapsto b'\}$ is the only possible substitution.
- If $\text{ONB}_I \{*\}$, we have $b' = *$ and there is nothing to do.
- If $\text{ONB}_{Q_1 \oplus Q_2} S \boxplus T$, there are two cases:
 - either $b' = \text{inl } b'_A$, in which case the induction hypothesis gives a unique $b_A \in S$ and a unique σ such that $\text{match}(\sigma, b_A, b'_A)$, and thus $\text{match}(\sigma, \text{inl } b_A, b)$ in a unique way,
 - or $b' = \text{inr } b'_B$, and a similar argument gives a unique match $\text{match}(\sigma, \text{inr } b_B, b')$.
- If $\text{ONB}_{Q_1 \otimes Q_2} S$, $b' = b'_A \otimes b'_B$, in both cases to derive ONB, we get unique b_A, b_B, σ_A and σ_B such that $\text{match}(\sigma_A \cup \sigma_B, b_A \otimes b_B, b')$.
- If $\text{ONB}_{\text{qnat}} S^{\oplus 0}$, there are two cases: either $b' = 0$, in which case there is nothing to do, or $b' = \mathbf{S } b''$, and the induction hypothesis gives a unique b and a unique σ such that $\text{match}(\sigma, b, b'')$ and thus $\text{match}(\sigma, \mathbf{S } b, b')$.

□

Observe that some of the results in this section do not involve linear combinations – except when the substitution is applied, of course. This is thanks to the choice of basis values, that allows to write unitary abstractions as $\{ \mid b_1 \mapsto e_1 \ \dots \mid b_n \mapsto e_n \}$, and to focus the pattern-matching on basis values only.

The definition of valuation σ does not involve any condition on types or type judgements. However, we need this sort of condition to formulate a substitution lemma, hence the next definition.

Definition 2.19. A valuation σ is said to be well-formed with regard to a context Γ if for all $(x_i : Q_i) \in \Gamma$, we have $\{x_i \mapsto e_i\} \subseteq \sigma$ and $\vdash e_i : Q_i$. We write $\Gamma \Vdash \sigma$.

Remark 2.20. The valuation σ obtained in Lemma 2.18 is well-formed iff b is.

Lemma 2.21. *Given a well-formed term $\Gamma \vdash t : Q$ and a well-formed valuation $\Gamma \Vdash \sigma$, then we have $\vdash \sigma(t) : Q$.*

Proof. The proof is done by induction on $\Gamma \vdash t : Q$.

- $\vdash * : I$. Direct.
- $x : Q \vdash x : Q$. Since $x : Q \Vdash \sigma$, there is a well-formed term t such that $\{x \mapsto e\} \subseteq \sigma$ and thus $\sigma(x)$ is well-formed.
- $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash t_1 \otimes t_2 : Q_1 \otimes Q_2$. By induction hypothesis, $\sigma(t_1)$ and $\sigma(t_2)$ are well-formed, and thus $\sigma(t_1 \otimes t_2) = \sigma(t_1) \otimes \sigma(t_2)$ is also well-formed.
- $\Gamma \vdash \text{inx } t : Q_1 \oplus Q_2$. By induction hypothesis, $\sigma(t)$ is well-formed, and thus $\text{inx } \sigma(t) = \sigma(\text{inx } t)$ is also well-formed.
- $\vdash 0 : \text{qnat}$. Direct.

- $\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{S} \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{qnat}$. By induction hypothesis, $\sigma(\mathbf{t})$ is well-formed, and thus $\mathbf{S} \sigma(\mathbf{t}) = \sigma(\mathbf{S} \mathbf{t})$ is also well-formed.
- $\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \mathbf{t}_i) : \mathbf{Q}$. By induction hypothesis, $\sigma(\mathbf{t}_i)$ is well-formed for all i , and thus $\Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \sigma(\mathbf{t}_i)) = \sigma(\Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \mathbf{t}_i))$ is also well-formed, thanks to Lemma 2.16.
- $\Gamma \vdash u \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{Q}_2$. By induction hypothesis, $\sigma(\mathbf{t})$ is well-formed, and thus $u \sigma(\mathbf{t}) = \sigma(u \mathbf{t})$ is also well-formed.

□

Substitutions, now properly defined, help us formalise how the language handles operations such as the β -reduction.

2.2. Hilbert spaces. One of the main focus in the study of mathematical quantum mechanics is Hilbert spaces. We assume basic knowledge of linear algebra, such as: vectors, linear maps, bases, kernels, *etc.*

2.2.1. Introductory Definitions. Formally, a Hilbert space is a vector space equipped with an inner product, written $\langle -, - \rangle$, and this inner product induces a complete metric space. The inner product is used to calculate probabilities of measurement outcomes in quantum theory. Note that, given a complex number α , we write $\bar{\alpha}$ its conjugate.

Definition 2.22 (Inner product). An inner product on a complex vector space V is an operator $\langle -, - \rangle : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, such that:

- for all $x, y \in V$, $\langle x, y \rangle = \overline{\langle y, x \rangle}$;
- for all $x, y, z \in V$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$\langle x, \alpha y \rangle = \alpha \langle x, y \rangle, \quad \langle x, y + z \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle + \langle x, z \rangle;$$

- for all $x \in V$, $\langle x, x \rangle \geq 0$, and if $\langle x, x \rangle = 0$, then $x = 0$.

Definition 2.23 (Norm). Given a vector space with an inner product, the norm of a vector x is defined as $\|x\| \triangleq \langle x, x \rangle$.

This is enough to state the definition of a Hilbert space.

Definition 2.24 (Hilbert space). A Hilbert space is a vector space H equipped with a *complete* inner product. By complete, we mean that: if a sequence of vectors $(v_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is such that $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \|v_i\| < \infty$, then there exists a vector $v \in H$ such that $\|v - \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} v_i\|$ tends to zero as n goes to the infinity. The vector v is called a *limit*.

It is interesting to observe that all finite-dimensional vector spaces with an inner product are complete. Moreover, any vector space with an inner product can be *completed*, by adding the adequate limit vectors.

Remark 2.25. A basis in a Hilbert space is not exactly defined the same way as a basis in a vector space. A basis in a Hilbert space is such that any vector is *limit* of a linear combination of the elements of the basis.

Definition 2.26 (Bounded linear map). Given two Hilbert spaces X and Y , a linear map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is *bounded* if there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|fx\| \leq \alpha\|x\|$ for all $x \in X$.

2.2.2. *Additional Structure.* We make use of different kinds of structure in vector spaces, such as direct sums and tensor products.

Definition 2.27 (Direct sum). Given two complex vector spaces V, W , one can form their *direct sum* $V \oplus W$, whose elements are (v, w) with $v \in V$ and $w \in W$, such that, for all $v, v' \in V$ and $w, w' \in W$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$, $\alpha(v, w) + \beta(v', w') = (\alpha v + \beta v', \alpha w + \beta w')$.

Remark 2.28. $V \oplus \{0\}$ is isomorphic to V , and given $v \in V$, $(v, 0)$ can be written v when there is no ambiguity. Given $v \in V$ and $w \in W$, (v, w) can sometimes be written $v + w$.

The structure of Hilbert space is preserved by the direct sum, with the following inner product: $\langle (x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \rangle_{X \oplus Y} = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle_X + \langle y_1, y_2 \rangle_Y$. However, this is not true for the tensor product.

Definition 2.29 (Tensor product). Given two complex vector spaces V, W , there is a vector space $V \otimes W$, together with a bilinear map $-\otimes -: V \times W \rightarrow V \otimes W :: (v, w) \mapsto v \otimes w$, such that for every bilinear map $h: V \times W \rightarrow Z$, there is a unique linear map $h': V \otimes W \rightarrow Z$, such that $h = h' \circ \otimes$.

The tensor product of two Hilbert spaces X and Y is obtained with the tensor product of the underlying vector spaces, with the inner product $\langle x_1 \otimes y_1, x_2 \otimes y_2 \rangle_{X \otimes Y} = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle_X \langle y_1, y_2 \rangle_Y$ and then the completion of this space gives the desired Hilbert spaces.

The category of Hilbert spaces and bounded linear maps between them, written **Hilb**, is symmetric monoidal with (\otimes, \mathbb{C}) and with $(\oplus, \{0\})$. Classical computers operate on bits, while quantum computers apply operations on qubits, written $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$. They are usually denoted as vectors in the Hilbert space $\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$ with $|0\rangle \triangleq (1, 0)$ and $|1\rangle \triangleq (0, 1)$ the elements of its canonical basis.

There is another important structure to Hilbert spaces, called the *adjoint*.

Lemma 2.30. *Given a linear map $f: X \rightarrow Y$ between Hilbert spaces, there is a unique $f^*: Y \rightarrow X$ such that for all $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$, $\langle f(x), y \rangle = \langle x, f^*(y) \rangle$. f^* is called the adjoint of f .*

The category **Hilb** is equipped with a structure of symmetric monoidal *dagger* category, meaning that $(-)^*$ is an involutive contravariant endofunctor which is the identity on objects. Moreover, the dagger and the monoidal tensor respect some coherence conditions. For example, given two bounded linear maps $f: X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and $g: X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$,

$$(f \otimes g)^* = f^* \otimes g^*: X_2 \otimes Y_2 \rightarrow X_1 \otimes Y_1.$$

Remark 2.31. Given two maps $f: X \rightarrow Y, g: Y \rightarrow Z$, we write $gf: X \rightarrow Z$ for the composition $g \circ f: X \rightarrow Z$. In addition, given a complex number α and a map $f: A \rightarrow B$, we write $\alpha f: X \rightarrow Y$ for the multiplication of the vector space $\alpha \cdot f: X \rightarrow Y$.

Definition 2.32. Given a morphism $f: X \rightarrow Y$ in **Hilb**, we say that f is:

- a unitary, if it is an isomorphism and $f^{-1} = f^*$;
- a contraction (or contractive map), if for all $x \in X$, $\|fx\| \leq \|x\|$;
- an isometry, if $f^*f = \text{id}$;
- a coisometry, if $ff^* = \text{id}$.

2.2.3. Quantum Computing. Note that Hilbert spaces and unitaries (resp. contractions) form a dagger category. They are wide subcategories of **Hilb**. Unitary maps are of central importance because they are the proper quantum operations, as solutions of the Schrödinger equation. One of the most significant unitary maps in quantum computing is the basis change in $\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$, also known as the *Hadamard gate*: $|0\rangle\langle+| + |1\rangle\langle-|$, where $|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ and $|-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$. We observe here that $|0\rangle\langle+|$ and $|1\rangle\langle-|$ are contractions, and that unitary maps can be formulated as linear combination of compatible contractive maps. Note also that the *states*, like $|0\rangle$, are isometries.

We write **Contr**, the category of *countably-dimensional* Hilbert spaces and contractive maps, **Isometry**, the category of *countably-dimensional* Hilbert and isometries between them, and **Coisometry** the category of *countably-dimensional* Hilbert spaces and coisometries between them. The category of *countably-dimensional* Hilbert spaces and bounded linear maps is often written **Hilb**^{N_o}.

Lemma 2.33 (Zero map). *Given any Hilbert spaces A, Y , there exists a linear map $0_{X,Y}: X \rightarrow Y$ whose image is $\{0\}$, we also write that $\text{Ker}(0_{X,Y}) = X$. When it is not ambiguous, we write $0: X \rightarrow Y$. It is a contractive map.*

Remark 2.34. Given a Hilbert space X , the morphism $0: X \rightarrow \{0\}$ is unique for every X and makes $\{0\}$ a terminal object in **Contr** and in **Coisometry**.

Contractions are widely used in the literature for the denotational semantics of quantum programming languages [HK22a, AMHK23, CHKS23]. Some recent developments expose axioms for the categories involved in this paper [HK22b, HKvdS22, MH24]. This better mathematical understanding of the category theory behind Hilbert spaces can only be beneficial for the theory of programming languages.

The ℓ^2 functor. The ℓ^2 functor [Heu13] is the closest there is to a free Hilbert space. Given a set X , the following:

$$\ell^2(X) \triangleq \{ \phi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \mid \sum_{x \in X} |\phi(x)|^2 < \infty \} \quad (2.1)$$

is actually a Hilbert space. Given an element $x \in X$, its counterpart in $\ell^2(X)$ (the ϕ such that $\phi(x) = 1$ and for all $y \neq x$, $\phi(y) = 0$) is written $|x\rangle$. The family $(|x\rangle)_{x \in X}$ is called the *canonical basis* of $\ell^2(X)$.

2.3. Hilbert spaces as a semantics. We build upon the notations and definitions presented in §2.2, where we outlined introductory notions on Hilbert spaces. Our goal is now to detail the tools necessary to interpret the pure quantum syntax in Hilbert spaces and specific linear maps between them. As a mean, we mostly work with contractions, that the reader can see as “subunitary” linear maps. We eventually show that we can interpret terms of our language as isometries (the proper maths for quantum states), and isometries are, in particular, contractions.

Sums. Given two maps $f, g: X \rightarrow Y$ in **Contr**, their linear algebraic sum $f + g$ is not necessarily a contraction. We introduce the notion of *compatibility*. This notion is inherited from the one in restriction and inverse categories [KAG17]. We use, in particular, an observation that links zero morphisms to compatibility in inverse categories; but this is adapted to Hilbert spaces in this section. In this context, the *join* is also different, as we use the algebraic sum inherited from the vector space structure.

Definition 2.35 (Compatibility). Given $f, g: X \rightarrow Y$ two maps in **Contr**, f and g are said to be compatible if $(\text{Ker } f)^\perp \cap (\text{Ker } g)^\perp = \{0\}$ and $\text{Im } f \cap \text{Im } g = \{0\}$.

This definition of compatibility ensures that there is no overlap between the inputs, and also between the outputs. The next lemma is then direct.

Lemma 2.36. *Given two compatible contractive maps $f, g: X \rightarrow Y$, $f + g$ is also contractive.*

As said above, the conditions in Def. 2.35 can be simplified in more algebraic expressions.

Lemma 2.37. *Given two contractive maps $f, g: X \rightarrow Y$, $f^*g = 0$ and $fg^* = 0$ implies that f and g are compatible.*

Remark 2.38. It might seem that the conditions introduced above are not symmetric on f and g . But one can observe that $0^* = 0$ and $(f^*g)^* = g^*f^{**} = g^*f$, thus $f^*g = 0$ iff $g^*f = 0$. Similarly, $fg^* = 0$ iff $gf^* = 0$.

Lemma 2.37 introduces a new point of view on compatibility, by describing the *orthogonality* between morphisms.

Example 2.39. The morphisms $|0\rangle\langle 0| : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ and $|1\rangle\langle 1| : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ are orthogonal in our loose sense, because the vectors $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ are orthogonal in the linear algebraic sense. This justifies that their linear sum $|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|$ is a contraction (and, in this case, it is also a unitary).

Additional structure. Unsurprisingly, the unit type is to be represented by the one-dimensional Hilbert space \mathbb{C} , the line of complex numbers. In the syntax, orthogonality and thus pattern-matching, depend on direct sums. The latter are interpreted as direct sums of Hilbert spaces. We show that this interpretation gives rise to orthogonality in the sense of contractions.

Definition 2.40. We write $\iota_l^{X,Y} : X \rightarrow X \oplus Y$ the isometry such that for all $x \in X$, $\iota_l^{X,Y}x = (x, 0)$; it is called the left injection. Similarly, the right injection is written $\iota_r^{X,Y} : Y \rightarrow X \oplus Y$.

Lemma 2.41. *Given two Hilbert spaces X, Y , $(\iota_l^{X,Y})^* \iota_r^{X,Y} = 0$ and $(\iota_r^{X,Y})^* \iota_l^{X,Y} = 0$.*

Example 2.42. The previous lemma ensures that $\iota_l^{X,Y}(\iota_l^{X,Y})^*$ and $\iota_r^{X,Y}(\iota_r^{X,Y})^*$ are compatible. Note that $\iota_l^{X,Y}(\iota_l^{X,Y})^* + \iota_r^{X,Y}(\iota_r^{X,Y})^* = \text{id}$.

Note that given a complex number α and a contraction $f: X \rightarrow Y$, the outer product $\alpha \cdot f$ is written αf when it is not ambiguous. Given a set S , we write $(\alpha_i)_{i \in S}$ a family of complex numbers indexed by S . Given two sets S and S' , we write $(\alpha_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in S \times S'}$ a matrix of complex numbers indexed by S and S' . The sets of indices can be omitted if there is not ambiguity, as in Lemma 2.43.

Lemma 2.43. *Given a family of pairwise output compatible isometries $f_i: X \rightarrow Y$, and a family of complex numbers α_i such that $\sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 = 1$, $\sum_i \alpha_i f_i$ is an isometry.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\sum_i \alpha_i f_i)^* \circ (\sum_j \alpha_j f_j) \\
&= (\sum_i \bar{\alpha}_i f_i^*) \circ (\sum_j \alpha_j f_j) && \text{(dagger and sum commute.)} \\
&= \sum_{i,j} (\bar{\alpha}_i \alpha_j) f_i^* \circ f_j && \text{(composition and sum commute.)} \\
&= \sum_i (\bar{\alpha}_i \alpha_i) f_i^* \circ f_i && \text{(\textit{f} are pairwise compatible.)} \\
&= \left(\sum_i \bar{\alpha}_i \alpha_i \right) \text{id} && \text{(\textit{f} are isometries.)} \\
&= \left(\sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 \right) \text{id} = \text{id}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

We recall that given two maps $f: X \rightarrow Z$ and $g: Y \rightarrow Z$ in **Contr**, if $f^*g = 0_{Z,X}$, we say that f and g are orthogonal. We show that this orthogonality is preserved by postcomposing with an isometry.

Lemma 2.44. *Given two orthogonal maps $f: X \rightarrow Z$ and $g: B \rightarrow Z$ in **Contr**, and given an isometry $h: Z \rightarrow W$, then $h \circ f: X \rightarrow W$ and $h \circ g: B \rightarrow W$ are also orthogonal.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
& (h \circ f)^* \circ h \circ g \\
&= f^* \circ h^* \circ h \circ g && \text{(dagger is contravariant.)} \\
&= f^* \circ \text{id}_Z \circ g = f^* \circ g && \text{(isometry.)} \\
&= 0_{Z,X} && \text{(hypothesis.)}
\end{aligned}$$

□

In a similar vein, the postcomposition of an isometry with an isometry says an isometry. This was already observed when we mentioned that Hilbert spaces and isometries form a category.

The canonical countably-dimensional Hilbert spaces is $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$, defined in §2.2.

Definition 2.45. We write $\text{succ}: \ell^2(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ the linear map $\ell^2(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow 1 \oplus \ell^2(\mathbb{N}) \cong \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$.

Remark 2.46. Note that succ can also be seen as the image of the successor function in natural numbers by the function ℓ^2 . The linear map succ is an isometry.

We recall that we write $|n\rangle$ for the elements of the canonical basis in $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$. Because of this, $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ can either be elements of \mathbb{C}^2 or $\ell^2(\mathbb{N})$. This is not an issue, since the natural embedding $\mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \ell^2(\mathbb{N})$ maps $|0\rangle$ to $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ to $|1\rangle$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \mathbf{Q} \rrbracket &: \mathbf{Hilb} \\
\llbracket \mathbf{I} \rrbracket &= \mathbb{C} \\
\llbracket \mathbf{Q}_1 \otimes \mathbf{Q}_2 \rrbracket &= \llbracket \mathbf{Q}_1 \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket \mathbf{Q}_2 \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \mathbf{Q}_1 \oplus \mathbf{Q}_2 \rrbracket &= \llbracket \mathbf{Q}_1 \rrbracket \oplus \llbracket \mathbf{Q}_2 \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \mathbf{qnat} \rrbracket &= \ell^2(\mathbb{N})
\end{aligned}$$

FIGURE 7. Interpretation of types.

Example 2.47.

$$\text{succ } |7\rangle = |8\rangle \quad \text{succ} \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} |9\rangle + \frac{1}{2} |11\rangle \right) = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} |10\rangle + \frac{1}{2} |12\rangle$$

Unitaries. The denotational semantics of our programming language involves unitary maps to interpret the functions. Those maps live in the category **Uni**, which is a rig category: it has bifunctor \oplus and \otimes inherited from **Hilb**. Hence the next lemma.

Lemma 2.48. *Given two maps $f: X \rightarrow Y$ and $g: Z \rightarrow W$ in **Uni**, $f \otimes g: X \otimes Z \rightarrow Y \otimes W$ is a map in **Uni** and $f \oplus g: X \oplus Z \rightarrow Y \oplus W$ is a map in **Uni**.*

Finally, we present an operation that is common to quantum computing, and thus preserves the unitary structure.

Lemma 2.49 (Controlled unitary). *Given a unitary map $f: X \rightarrow X$, there is a unitary map $\text{ctrl}_A(f): (\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}) \otimes X \rightarrow (\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}) \otimes X$ such that $\text{ctrl}_X(f) = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \text{id} + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes f$.*

2.4. Denotational Semantics. As usual, we write $\llbracket - \rrbracket$ for the interpretation of types and term judgements. As mentioned in the previous section, the presentation makes extensive use of contractions for the denotational semantics. However, values and terms are directly announced to be isometries, for clarity. It also help us highlight the fact that values and terms represent sound quantum states. In the same vein, the interpretation of unitaries is given as unitary maps between two Hilbert spaces; but the proof that the semantics of a unitary abstraction is unitary requires the mathematical development at the level of contractions.

Types. The interpretation of a type \mathbf{Q} is given by a countably-dimensional Hilbert space. It is given by induction on the grammar of the types. This interpretation is detailed in Figure 7.

Expressions. Judgements for expressions are interpreted as contractions between Hilbert spaces. A judgement is of the form $\Gamma \vdash e: \mathbf{Q}$, and its interpretation is written $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash e: \mathbf{Q} \rrbracket$. Contexts $\Gamma = x_1: \mathbf{Q}_1 \dots x_n: \mathbf{Q}_n$ are given a denotation $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket = \llbracket \mathbf{Q}_1 \rrbracket \otimes \dots \otimes \llbracket \mathbf{Q}_n \rrbracket$. When it is not ambiguous, the interpretation of the judgement $\Gamma \vdash e: \mathbf{Q}$ is written $\llbracket e \rrbracket$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \llbracket \Gamma \vdash v : Q \rrbracket : \mathbf{Isometry}(\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, \llbracket Q \rrbracket) \\
& \llbracket \vdash * : I \rrbracket = \text{id}_{\llbracket I \rrbracket} \\
& \llbracket x : Q \vdash x : Q \rrbracket = \text{id}_{\llbracket Q \rrbracket} \\
& \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \text{inl } e : Q_1 \oplus Q_2 \rrbracket = \iota_l^{\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket, \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket} \circ \llbracket \Gamma \vdash e : Q_1 \rrbracket \\
& \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \text{inr } e : Q_1 \oplus Q_2 \rrbracket = \iota_r^{\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket, \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket} \circ \llbracket \Gamma \vdash e : Q_2 \rrbracket \\
& \llbracket \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash e \otimes e' : Q_1 \otimes Q_2 \rrbracket = \llbracket \Gamma_1 \vdash e : Q_1 \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket \Gamma_2 \vdash e' : Q_2 \rrbracket \\
& \llbracket \vdash 0 : \text{qnat} \rrbracket = |0\rangle \\
& \llbracket \Gamma \vdash S e : \text{qnat} \rrbracket = \text{succ} \circ \llbracket \Gamma \vdash e : \text{qnat} \rrbracket \\
& \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \sum_{i \leq k} (\alpha_i \cdot e_i) : Q \rrbracket = \sum_{i \leq k} \alpha_i \llbracket \Gamma \vdash e_i : Q \rrbracket
\end{aligned}$$

FIGURE 8. Interpretation of value judgements as morphisms in **Isometry**.

Lemma 2.50 (Isometry). *If $\Gamma \vdash e : Q$ is a well-formed value judgement, then $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash e : Q \rrbracket$ is an isometry.*

In quantum physics, the state of a particle is usually described as an isometry. Showing that our expressions are interpreted as isometries, we can justify that they are correct *quantum states*. The proof of the previous lemma is included in one of a larger result, showing that the denotation of all terms are isometries (see Lemma 2.63). Moreover, expressions are used to define the unitary abstractions as a collection of patterns: it is sensible to prove that these patterns are interpreted with compatible morphisms, in the sense of Definition 2.35.

Lemma 2.51. *Given $i \neq j$, two judgements $\Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 : Q$ and $\Gamma_2 \vdash e_2 : Q$, such that $e_1 \perp e_2$, we have $\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket = 0$.*

Proof. The proof is done by induction on the derivation of \perp . It is a subproof of the one for Lemma 2.62. \square

This result can also be stated for the predicate ONB, with the help of Lemma 2.13, where it is shown that two values in an orthogonal decomposition are orthogonal.

Lemma 2.52. *Given $i \neq j$, two judgements $\Gamma_1 \vdash e_1 : Q$ and $\Gamma_2 \vdash e_2 : Q_1$, a set of S that contains e_1 and e_2 and such that $\text{ONB}^e_Q S$, we have $\llbracket e_1 \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket = 0$.*

The predicate ONB provides more information on the *basis* S ; namely, that it is exhaustive. The next lemma shows that a linear function that maps each element of the basis to itself is the identity.

Lemma 2.53. *Given $\text{ONB}^e_Q \{e_i\}_{i \leq n}$, and $\Gamma_i \vdash e_i : Q$ for all i , we have*

$$\sum_{i \leq n} \llbracket e_i \rrbracket \circ \llbracket e_i \rrbracket^* = \text{id}_{\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket}.$$

Proof. The proof is done by induction on ONB.

- $\text{ONB}^e_Q \{x\}$. $\llbracket x \rrbracket \circ \llbracket x \rrbracket^* = \text{id}_{\llbracket Q \rrbracket} \circ \text{id}_{\llbracket Q \rrbracket} = \text{id}_{\llbracket Q \rrbracket}$.
- $\text{ONB}^e_I \{*\}$. $\llbracket * \rrbracket \circ \llbracket * \rrbracket^* = \text{id}_{\llbracket I \rrbracket} \circ \text{id}_{\llbracket I \rrbracket} = \text{id}_{\llbracket I \rrbracket}$.

- $\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1 \oplus Q_2} S \boxplus T$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{e \in S \boxplus T} \llbracket e \rrbracket \circ \llbracket e \rrbracket^* \\
&= \sum_{s \in S} \llbracket \text{inl } s \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \text{inl } s \rrbracket^* + \sum_{t \in T} \llbracket \text{inr } t \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \text{inr } t \rrbracket^* && \text{(by definition.)} \\
&= \iota_l \circ \left(\sum_{s \in S} \llbracket s \rrbracket \circ \llbracket s \rrbracket^* \right) \circ \iota_l^* + \iota_r \circ \left(\sum_{t \in T} \llbracket t \rrbracket \circ \llbracket t \rrbracket^* \right) \circ \iota_r^* && \text{(by linearity.)} \\
&= \iota_l \circ \text{id}_{\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket} \circ \iota_l^* + \iota_r \circ \text{id}_{\llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket} \circ \iota_r^* && \text{(by IH.)} \\
&= \iota_l \iota_l^* + \iota_r \iota_r^* = \text{id}_{\llbracket Q_1 \oplus Q_2 \rrbracket}. && \text{(Ex. 2.42.)}
\end{aligned}$$

- $\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1 \otimes Q_2} S$. Suppose that $\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1} \pi_1(S)$ and $\text{ONB}^e_{Q_2} S_e^1$ for all $e \in \pi_1(S)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{(e \otimes e') \in S} \llbracket e \otimes e' \rrbracket \circ \llbracket e \otimes e' \rrbracket^* \\
&= \sum_{(e \otimes e') \in S} (\llbracket e \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket e' \rrbracket) \circ (\llbracket e \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket e' \rrbracket)^* && \text{(by definition.)} \\
&= \sum_{(e \otimes e') \in S} (\llbracket e \rrbracket \circ \llbracket e \rrbracket^*) \otimes (\llbracket e' \rrbracket \circ \llbracket e' \rrbracket^*) && \text{(by monoidal } \dagger \text{-category.)} \\
&= \sum_{e \in \pi_1(S)} (\llbracket e \rrbracket \circ \llbracket e \rrbracket^*) \otimes \left(\sum_{e' \in S_b^1} \llbracket e' \rrbracket \circ \llbracket e' \rrbracket^* \right) \\
&= \sum_{e \in \pi_1(S)} (\llbracket e \rrbracket \circ \llbracket e \rrbracket^*) \otimes \text{id}_{\llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket} && \text{(by IH.)} \\
&= \left(\sum_{e \in \pi_1(S)} \llbracket e \rrbracket \circ \llbracket e \rrbracket^* \right) \otimes \text{id}_{\llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket} && \text{(by linearity.)} \\
&= \text{id}_{\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket} \otimes \text{id}_{\llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket} = \text{id}_{\llbracket Q_1 \otimes Q_2 \rrbracket}. && \text{(by IH.)}
\end{aligned}$$

- $\text{ONB}^e_{\text{qnat}} S^{\oplus 0}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{e \in S^{\oplus 0}} \llbracket e \rrbracket \circ \llbracket e \rrbracket^* \\
&= \llbracket 0 \rrbracket \circ \llbracket 0 \rrbracket + \sum_{s \in S} \llbracket S s \rrbracket \circ \llbracket S s \rrbracket^* && \text{(by definition.)} \\
&= \llbracket 0 \rrbracket \circ \llbracket 0 \rrbracket^* + \text{succ} \circ \left(\sum_{s \in S} \llbracket s \rrbracket \circ \llbracket s \rrbracket^* \right) \circ \text{succ}^* && \text{(by linearity.)} \\
&= \llbracket 0 \rrbracket \circ \llbracket 0 \rrbracket^* + \text{succ} \circ \text{id}_{\llbracket \text{qnat} \rrbracket} \circ \text{succ}^* = \text{id}_{\llbracket \text{qnat} \rrbracket}. && \text{(by IH.)}
\end{aligned}$$

- $\text{ONB}^e_Q S^\alpha$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{e \in S^\alpha} \llbracket e \rrbracket \circ \llbracket e \rrbracket^* \\
&= \sum_{b \in S} \llbracket \sum_{s' \in S} (\alpha_{s,s'} \cdot s') \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \sum_{s' \in S} (\alpha_{s,s'} \cdot s') \rrbracket^* && \text{(by definition.)} \\
&= \sum_{s \in S} \left(\sum_{s' \in S} \alpha_{s,s'} \llbracket s' \rrbracket \right) \circ \left(\sum_{s'' \in S} \alpha_{s,s''} \llbracket s'' \rrbracket \right)^* && \text{(by definition.)} \\
&= \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{s', s'' \in S} \alpha_{s,s'} \overline{\alpha_{s,s''}} \llbracket s' \rrbracket \circ \llbracket s'' \rrbracket^* && \text{(by linearity.)} \\
&= \sum_{s', s'' \in S} \left(\sum_{s \in S} \alpha_{s,s'} \overline{\alpha_{s,s''}} \right) \llbracket s' \rrbracket \circ \llbracket s'' \rrbracket^* \\
&= \sum_{s', s'' \in S} \delta_{s'=s''} \llbracket s' \rrbracket \circ \llbracket s'' \rrbracket^* = \sum_{s' \in S} \llbracket s' \rrbracket \circ \llbracket s' \rrbracket^* && \text{(by unitarity.)} \\
&= \text{id}_{\llbracket Q \rrbracket}. && \text{(by IH.)}
\end{aligned}$$

□

One final development on the interpretation of values is the link with substitutions, detailed in the next proposition.

Proposition 2.54. *Given a well-formed term $\Gamma \vdash t : Q$ and for all $(x_i : Q_i) \in \Gamma$, a well-formed expression $\vdash e_i : Q_i$; if $\sigma = \{x_i \mapsto e_i\}_i$, then:*

$$\llbracket \vdash \sigma(t) : Q \rrbracket = \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : Q \rrbracket \circ \left(\bigotimes_i \llbracket \vdash e_i : Q_i \rrbracket \right).$$

We then define $\llbracket \sigma \rrbracket = \bigotimes_i \llbracket \vdash e_i : Q_i \rrbracket$.

Proof. The proof is straightforward by induction on the formation rules for t . □

Remark 2.55. The definition of the interpretation of a substitution above is somewhat informal. It would require a lot of care and unnecessary details to make the denotation of σ fit the denotation of a particular context Γ . Since we are working in symmetric monoidal categories, those details will be overlooked when working with substitutions. We assume that we work up to permutations, and that when an interpretation of a substitution is involved, it is with the right permutation.

Substitutions σ emerge from the matching of two basis values, thus we can prove that the interpretation of the matching gives the interpretation of the substitution, as stated in the next lemma.

Lemma 2.56. *Given two well-formed basis values $\Gamma \vdash b : Q$ and $\vdash b' : Q$, and a substitution σ , if $\text{match}(\sigma, b, b')$ then $\llbracket b \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket b' \rrbracket = \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket$.*

Proof. The proof is straightforward by induction on $\text{match}(\sigma, b, b')$. □

Unitaries. The type of unitaries are given as $U(Q_1, Q_2)$, and they are first interpreted as morphisms $\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket$ in **Contr**, before showing that their interpretation actually lies in **Uni**. We also show that the ONB conditions ensure that the denotation of (syntactic) unitaries is not only a contractive map, but a unitary between Hilbert spaces. Working with contractions is necessary to use the notion of compatibility: given a unitary $\{ \mid b_1 \mapsto e_1 \dots \mid b_n \mapsto e_n \} : U(Q_1, Q_2)$, we provide an interpretation to each clause $b_i \mapsto e_i$ as a contraction $\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket$, and prove that all the contractions thus obtained are compatible, and can be summed. Unitary judgments are of the form $\Vdash u : U(Q_1, Q_2)$, and their semantics is given by a morphism in **Uni**:

$$\llbracket \Vdash u : U(Q_1, Q_2) \rrbracket : \mathbf{Uni}(\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket, \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket).$$

Given $\Vdash \{ \mid b_1 \mapsto e_1 \dots \mid b_n \mapsto e_n \} : U(Q_1, Q_2)$, the interpretation of a clause $b_i \mapsto e_i$ is the following contraction: $\llbracket \Gamma_i \vdash e_i : B \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \Gamma_i \vdash b_i : Q_1 \rrbracket^*$. It should be read as follows: if the input of type Q_1 matches with b_i , it provides a substitution with Γ_i , that is applied to e_i . This is better understood with a diagram:

$$\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\llbracket \Gamma_i \vdash b_i : Q_1 \rrbracket^*} \llbracket \Gamma_i \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\llbracket \Gamma_i \vdash e_i : Q_2 \rrbracket} \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket$$

Lemma 2.52 ensures that the semantics of clauses in a well-formed unitary are pairwise compatible. The interpretation of a unitary abstraction is then:

$$\llbracket \Vdash \{ \mid b_1 \mapsto e_1 \dots \mid b_n \mapsto e_n \} : U(Q_1, Q_2) \rrbracket = \sum_{i \leq n} \llbracket \Gamma_i \vdash e_i : Q_2 \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \Gamma_i \vdash b_i : Q_1 \rrbracket^*.$$

This new contraction is the *union*, or the *join*, of the interpretations of all the clauses. One can only take the *join* of compatible morphisms. It is left to prove that it is well-defined, and then that it is a proper unitary operation.

Corollary 2.57. *Given $\Vdash \{ \mid b_1 \mapsto e_1 \dots \mid b_n \mapsto e_n \} : U(Q_1, Q_2)$, its interpretation*

$$\llbracket \Vdash \{ \mid b_1 \mapsto e_1 \dots \mid b_n \mapsto e_n \} : U(Q_1, Q_2) \rrbracket$$

*is a well-defined morphism in **Contr**.*

Proof. Given $\Vdash \{ \mid b_1 \mapsto e_1 \dots \mid b_n \mapsto e_n \} : U(Q_1, Q_2)$, we know that $\text{ONB}_{Q_2}^e(\{e_i\}_{i \leq n})$ and $\text{ONB}_{Q_1}(\{b_i\}_{i \leq n})$ hold, and for all $i \leq n$, $\Gamma_i \vdash b_i : Q_1$ and $\Gamma_i \vdash e_i : Q_2$.

Since $\text{ONB}_{Q_1}(\{b_i\}_{i \leq n})$ holds, Lemma 2.52 ensures that for all $i \neq j \leq n$, $\llbracket b_i \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket b_j \rrbracket = 0_{\llbracket \Gamma_j \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma_i \rrbracket}$. The same lemma with $\text{ONB}_{Q_2}^e(\{e_i\}_{i \leq n})$ ensures that for all $i \neq j \leq n$, $\llbracket e_i \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket e_j \rrbracket = 0_{\llbracket \Gamma_j \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma_i \rrbracket}$. This proves that, for all $i \neq j \leq n$, $(\llbracket e_i \rrbracket \circ \llbracket b_i \rrbracket^*)^* \circ \llbracket e_j \rrbracket \circ \llbracket b_j \rrbracket^* = 0_{\llbracket \Gamma_j \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma_i \rrbracket}$ and $\llbracket v_i \rrbracket \circ \llbracket b_i \rrbracket^* \circ (\llbracket e_j \rrbracket \circ \llbracket b_j \rrbracket^*)^* = 0_{\llbracket \Gamma_j \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma_i \rrbracket}$. This proves that for all $i \neq j \leq n$, $\llbracket e_i \rrbracket \circ \llbracket b_i \rrbracket^*$ and $\llbracket e_j \rrbracket \circ \llbracket b_j \rrbracket^*$ are compatible, thanks to Lemma 2.37. Then, Lemma 2.36 ensures that $\sum_{i \leq n} \llbracket e_i \rrbracket \circ \llbracket b_i \rrbracket^*$ is a contraction. \square

Theorem 2.58. *Given $\Vdash \{ \mid b_1 \mapsto e_1 \dots \mid b_n \mapsto e_n \} : U(Q_1, Q_2)$, its interpretation*

$$\llbracket \Vdash \{ \mid b_1 \mapsto e_1 \dots \mid b_n \mapsto e_n \} : U(Q_1, Q_2) \rrbracket$$

is unitary.

Proof. Given $\Vdash \{ \mid b_1 \mapsto e_1 \dots \mid b_n \mapsto e_n \} : U(Q_1, Q_2)$, we know that $\text{ONB}_{Q_2}^e(\{e_i\}_{i \leq n})$ and $\text{ONB}_{Q_1}(\{b_i\}_{i \leq n})$ hold, and for all $i \leq n$, $\Gamma_i \vdash b_i : Q_1$ and $\Gamma_i \vdash e_i : Q_2$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \vdash u : Q_1 \mapsto Q_2 \rrbracket &: \mathbf{Uni}(\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket, \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket \{ \mid \mathbf{b}_i \mapsto \mathbf{e}_i \}_i \rrbracket &= \sum_{i \in I} \llbracket \mathbf{e}_i \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}_i \rrbracket^* \\
\llbracket u_2 \circ u_1 \rrbracket &= \llbracket u_2 \rrbracket \circ \llbracket u_1 \rrbracket \\
\llbracket u_1 \otimes u_2 \rrbracket &= \llbracket u_1 \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket u_2 \rrbracket \\
\llbracket u_1 \oplus u_2 \rrbracket &= \llbracket u_1 \rrbracket \oplus \llbracket u_2 \rrbracket \\
\llbracket u^* \rrbracket &= \llbracket u \rrbracket^* \\
\llbracket \text{ctrl } u \rrbracket &= \text{ctrl}_{\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket}(\llbracket u \rrbracket)
\end{aligned}$$

FIGURE 9. Interpretation of unitaries in **Uni**.

First step, prove that $\llbracket u \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket u \rrbracket = \text{id}_{\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket}$, with $u = \{ \mid \mathbf{b}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{e}_1 \dots \mid \mathbf{b}_n \mapsto \mathbf{e}_n \}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\llbracket u \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket u \rrbracket \\
&= \left(\sum_{i \leq n} \llbracket \mathbf{e}_i \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}_i \rrbracket^* \right)^* \circ \sum_{j \leq n} \llbracket \mathbf{e}_j \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}_j \rrbracket^* && \text{(by definition.)} \\
&= \sum_{i \leq n} (\llbracket \mathbf{e}_i \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}_i \rrbracket^*)^* \circ \sum_{j \leq n} \llbracket \mathbf{e}_j \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}_j \rrbracket^* && \text{(dagger distributes over sum.)} \\
&= \sum_{i \leq n} \llbracket \mathbf{b}_i \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \mathbf{e}_i \rrbracket^* \circ \sum_{j \leq n} \llbracket \mathbf{e}_j \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}_j \rrbracket^* && \text{(dagger is contravariant.)} \\
&= \sum_{i, j \leq n} \llbracket \mathbf{b}_i \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \mathbf{e}_i \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket \mathbf{e}_j \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}_j \rrbracket^* && \text{(linearity.)} \\
&= \sum_{i \leq n} \llbracket \mathbf{b}_i \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \mathbf{e}_i \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket \mathbf{e}_i \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}_i \rrbracket^* && \text{(lemma 2.52.)} \\
&= \sum_{i \leq n} \llbracket \mathbf{b}_i \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}_i \rrbracket^* && \text{(lemma 2.50.)} \\
&= \text{id}_{\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket} && \text{(lemma 2.53.)}
\end{aligned}$$

The other direction $\llbracket u \rrbracket \circ \llbracket u \rrbracket^* = \text{id}_{\llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket}$ is similar. □

Note that we have only proven so far that unitary abstractions have a sound denotational semantics in **Uni**. The interpretation of operations on unitaries is given in Figure 9. It is explained in §2.3 why this interpretation is in **Uni**, although this does not come as a surprise.

Moreover, any canonical symmetric monoidal isomorphism can be represented by the unitaries of our language. The canonical symmetric monoidal isomorphisms are simply those that can be defined using the structure of a symmetric monoidal category only, *i.e.* isomorphisms that are given by: left and right unitors, symmetric swaps, associators, closed under composition and tensor products. We use this result later for quantum configurations.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : Q \rrbracket : \mathbf{Isometry}(\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket, \llbracket Q \rrbracket) \\
& \llbracket \vdash * : I \rrbracket = \text{id}_{\llbracket I \rrbracket} \\
& \llbracket x : Q \vdash x : Q \rrbracket = \text{id}_{\llbracket Q \rrbracket} \\
& \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \text{inl } t : Q_1 \oplus Q_2 \rrbracket = \iota_l^{\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket, \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket} \circ \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : Q_1 \rrbracket \\
& \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \text{inr } t : Q_1 \oplus Q_2 \rrbracket = \iota_r^{\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket, \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket} \circ \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : Q_1 \rrbracket \\
& \llbracket \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash t \otimes t' : Q_1 \otimes Q_2 \rrbracket = \llbracket \Gamma_1 \vdash t : Q_1 \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket \Gamma_2 \vdash t' : Q_2 \rrbracket \\
& \llbracket \vdash 0 : \mathbf{qnat} \rrbracket = |0\rangle \\
& \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{S } t : \mathbf{qnat} \rrbracket = \text{succ} \circ \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : \mathbf{qnat} \rrbracket \\
& \llbracket \Gamma \vdash \Sigma_{i \leq k} (\alpha_i \cdot t_i) : Q \rrbracket = \sum_{i \leq k} \alpha_i \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t_i : Q \rrbracket \\
& \llbracket \Gamma \vdash u t : Q_2 \rrbracket = \llbracket \vdash u : U(Q_1, Q_2) \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : Q_1 \rrbracket
\end{aligned}$$

FIGURE 10. Interpretation of term judgements as morphisms in **Isometry**.

Proposition 2.59. *Let Q_1 and Q_2 be two pure types, and let $f : \llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket$ be a canonical symmetric monoidal isomorphism. Then, there exists a unitary $\llbracket \vdash u : U(Q_1, Q_2) \rrbracket$ such that $\llbracket u \rrbracket = f$.*

Terms. One remaining term is the application of a unitary.

$$\llbracket \Gamma \vdash u t : Q_2 \rrbracket = \llbracket \vdash u : U(Q_1, Q_2) \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t : Q_1 \rrbracket.$$

The interpretation of all term judgements is found in Figure 10.

We can already show that this interpretation of terms is sound with the sketch of operational semantics given in the previous section.

Proposition 2.60 (Operational Soundness). *Given a well-formed unitary abstraction $\llbracket \vdash \{ \mid \mathbf{b}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{e}_1 \dots \mid \mathbf{b}_n \mapsto \mathbf{e}_n \} : U(Q_1, Q_2) \rrbracket$ and a well-formed basis value $\vdash \mathbf{b}' : Q_1$, if $\text{match}(\sigma, \mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}')$, then*

$$\llbracket \vdash \{ \mid \mathbf{b}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{e}_1 \dots \mid \mathbf{b}_n \mapsto \mathbf{e}_n \} \mathbf{b}' : Q_2 \rrbracket = \llbracket \vdash \sigma(\mathbf{e}_i) : Q_2 \rrbracket.$$

Proof. First, we deduce from the assumption $\text{match}(\sigma, \mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}')$ that

- $\neg(\mathbf{b}_i \perp \mathbf{b}')$, and thus $\llbracket \mathbf{b}_i \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}' \rrbracket = \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket$, thanks to Lemma 2.56.
- for all $j \neq i$, $\mathbf{b}_j \perp \mathbf{b}'$, and thus $\llbracket \mathbf{b}_j \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}' \rrbracket = 0$, thanks to Lemma 2.51.

We can then compute the semantics, with $u \triangleq \{ \mid \mathbf{b}_1 \mapsto \mathbf{e}_1 \ \dots \mid \mathbf{b}_n \mapsto \mathbf{e}_n \}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \llbracket u \ \mathbf{b}' \rrbracket \\
&= \llbracket u \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}' \rrbracket && \text{(by definition.)} \\
&= \left(\sum_j \llbracket \mathbf{e}_j \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}_j \rrbracket^* \right) \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}' \rrbracket && \text{(by definition.)} \\
&= \sum_j \llbracket \mathbf{e}_j \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}_j \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}' \rrbracket && \text{(linearity.)} \\
&= \llbracket \mathbf{e}_i \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}_i \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket \mathbf{b}' \rrbracket && \text{(lemma 2.51.)} \\
&= \llbracket \mathbf{e}_i \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \sigma \rrbracket && \text{(lemma 2.56.)} \\
&= \llbracket \sigma(\mathbf{e}_i) \rrbracket && \text{(prop. 2.54.)}
\end{aligned}$$

□

We prove that, like expressions, terms are indeed interpreted as isometries, reinforcing the link with quantum physics. This requires several lemmas. The first lemma shows that the denotational orthogonality is preserved by linear combinations.

Lemma 2.61. *Given $\Gamma_1 \vdash t: \mathbf{Q}$ and $\Gamma_2 \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \mathbf{t}_i): \mathbf{Q}$ such that for all i , $\llbracket \Gamma_1 \vdash t: \mathbf{Q} \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket \Gamma_2 \vdash \mathbf{t}_i: \mathbf{Q} \rrbracket = 0_{\llbracket \Gamma_2 \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma_1 \rrbracket}$; then $\llbracket \Gamma_1 \vdash t: A \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket \Gamma_2 \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \mathbf{t}_i): \mathbf{Q} \rrbracket = 0_{\llbracket \Gamma_2 \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma_1 \rrbracket}$.*

Proof. The proof involves few steps, without surprises.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \llbracket \Gamma_1 \vdash t: \mathbf{Q} \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket \Gamma_2 \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \mathbf{t}_i): \mathbf{Q} \rrbracket \\
&= \llbracket \Gamma_1 \vdash t: \mathbf{Q} \rrbracket^* \circ \sum_i \alpha_i \llbracket \Gamma_2 \vdash \mathbf{t}_i: \mathbf{Q} \rrbracket && \text{(by definition.)} \\
&= \sum_i \alpha_i \llbracket \Gamma_1 \vdash t: \mathbf{Q} \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket \Gamma_2 \vdash \mathbf{t}_i: \mathbf{Q} \rrbracket && \text{(by linearity.)} \\
&= \sum_i \alpha_i 0_{\llbracket \Gamma_2 \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma_1 \rrbracket} && \text{(hypothesis.)} \\
&= 0_{\llbracket \Gamma_2 \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma_1 \rrbracket}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

The next lemma states that syntactic orthogonality (defined in Definition 2.4) implies denotational orthogonality.

Lemma 2.62. *Given two judgements $\Gamma_1 \vdash \mathbf{t}_1: \mathbf{Q}$ and $\Gamma_2 \vdash \mathbf{t}_2: \mathbf{Q}$, such that $\mathbf{t}_1 \perp \mathbf{t}_2$, we have $\llbracket \mathbf{t}_1 \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket \mathbf{t}_2 \rrbracket = 0_{\llbracket \Gamma_2 \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma_1 \rrbracket}$.*

The proof of this lemma is interdependent with the proof of the next lemma, where it is proven that the interpretation of term judgement are sound quantum states, namely, isometries.

Lemma 2.63 (Isometry). *If $\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{t}: \mathbf{Q}$ is a well-formed judgement, then $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{t}: \mathbf{Q} \rrbracket$ is an isometry.*

Proof of Lemma 2.62 and Lemma 2.63. We prove both theorems in a row, because they are interdependent. We remind the whole statement: Given a well-formed judgement $\Gamma_1 \vdash \mathbf{t}_1: \mathbf{Q}$,

- $\llbracket \Gamma_1 \vdash t_1 : Q \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket \Gamma_1 \vdash t_1 : Q \rrbracket = \text{id}_{\llbracket \Gamma_1 \rrbracket}$;
- for all $\Gamma_2 \vdash t_2 : Q$ such that $t_1 \perp t_2$, $\llbracket \Gamma_1 \vdash t_1 : Q \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket \Gamma_2 \vdash t_2 : Q \rrbracket = 0_{\llbracket \Gamma_2 \rrbracket, \llbracket \Gamma_1 \rrbracket}$.

We prove by induction on the formation rules of values that $\llbracket t \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket t \rrbracket = \text{id}_{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket}$.

- $\vdash * : I$. $\llbracket * \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket * \rrbracket = \text{id}_{\llbracket I \rrbracket} \circ \text{id}_{\llbracket I \rrbracket} = \text{id}_{\llbracket I \rrbracket}$. This term is not orthogonal to any other well-formed term.
- $x : Q \vdash x : Q$. $\llbracket x \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket x \rrbracket = \text{id}_{\llbracket Q \rrbracket} \circ \text{id}_{\llbracket Q \rrbracket} = \text{id}_{\llbracket Q \rrbracket}$. This term is not orthogonal to any other.
- $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash t_1 \otimes t_2 : Q_1 \otimes Q_2$. We first prove that its denotation is an isometry.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket t_1 \otimes t_2 \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket t_1 \otimes t_2 \rrbracket &= (\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket t_2 \rrbracket)^* \circ (\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket t_2 \rrbracket) && \text{(by definition.)} \\
&= (\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket^* \otimes \llbracket t_2 \rrbracket^*) \circ (\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket t_2 \rrbracket) && (* \text{ is monoidal.}) \\
&= (\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket t_1 \rrbracket) \otimes (\llbracket t_2 \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket t_2 \rrbracket) && (\otimes \text{ is monoidal.}) \\
&= \text{id}_{\llbracket \Gamma_1 \rrbracket} \otimes \text{id}_{\llbracket \Gamma_2 \rrbracket} && \text{(IH.)} \\
&= \text{id}_{\llbracket \Gamma_1 \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket \Gamma_2 \rrbracket} = \text{id}_{\llbracket \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \rrbracket}
\end{aligned}$$

Then we show that, if it is orthogonal to any other well-formed term, say $\Gamma_3 \vdash t_3 : Q_1 \otimes Q_2$, then their interpretations are also orthogonal. We reason on a case by case basis. The term t_3 can be of the form $t'_3 \otimes t''_3$, in which case, either $t_1 \perp t'_3$ or $t_2 \perp t''_3$. In both cases, the result is direct, because the zero morphism tensored with any other morphism is still zero. The other cases is t_3 being a linear combination; this case is covered by Lemma 2.61.

- $\Gamma \vdash \text{inx } t : Q_1 \oplus Q_2$. The denotation of this term is an isometry because the injections ι also are and a composition of isometries keeps being an isometry. Now, given another term $\Gamma_1 \vdash t_2 : Q_2$ such that $\text{inx } t \perp t_2$, we have several cases:
 - either t_2 is of the form $\text{inx } t'_2$ with the same injection as $\text{inx } t$, and the result is given by Lemma 2.44;
 - or $\text{inx } t = \text{inl } t$ and $t_2 = \text{inr } t'_2$, in which case the conclusion is direct thanks to Lemma 2.41 and the induction hypothesis;
 - or t_2 is a linear combination, and Lemma 2.61 concludes.
- $\vdash 0 : \text{qnat}$. $\llbracket 0 \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket 0 \rrbracket = \langle 0 \rangle 0 = 1 = \text{id}_{\llbracket I \rrbracket}$. Moreover, given any natural number n , $\langle 0 \rangle n + 1 = 0$. Lemma 2.61 concludes for linear combinations.
- $\Gamma \vdash \text{S } t : \text{qnat}$. The interpretation is an isometry by composition of isometries. The orthogonality part is either ensured with the last point, or by Lemma 2.44 and the induction hypothesis.
- $\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i) : Q$. The interpretation is an isometry by induction hypothesis and Lemma 2.43. Moreover, the only case of orthogonality not yet covered: given that for all

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t : A}{\Gamma \vdash t = t : A} \text{ (refl)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 = t_2 : A}{\Gamma \vdash t_2 = t_1 : A} \text{ (symm)} \\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 = t_2 : A \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 = t_3 : A}{\Gamma \vdash t_1 = t_3 : A} \text{ (trans)}
\end{array}$$

FIGURE 11. Basic equational rules.

$i \neq j \in I$, $t_i \perp t_j$, $J, K \subseteq I$, and $\sum_{i \in J \cap K} \bar{\alpha}_i \beta_i = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \llbracket \sum_j (\alpha_j \cdot t_j) \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket \sum_k (\beta_k \cdot t_k) \rrbracket \\
&= \left(\sum_j \alpha_j \llbracket t_j \rrbracket \right)^* \circ \sum_k \beta_k \llbracket t_k \rrbracket && \text{(by definition.)} \\
&= \left(\sum_j \bar{\alpha}_j \llbracket t_j \rrbracket^* \right) \circ \sum_k \beta_k \llbracket t_k \rrbracket && \text{(dagger distributes over the sum.)} \\
&= \sum_{j,k} \bar{\alpha}_j \beta_k \llbracket t_j \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket t_k \rrbracket && \text{(by linearity.)} \\
&= \sum_{i \in J \cap K} \bar{\alpha}_i \beta_i \llbracket t_i \rrbracket^* \circ \llbracket t_i \rrbracket && \text{(by induction hypothesis.)} \\
&= \sum_{i \in J \cap K} \bar{\alpha}_i \beta_i \text{id}_{\llbracket \mathbf{r} \rrbracket} && \text{(by induction hypothesis.)} \\
&= \left(\sum_{i \in J \cap K} \bar{\alpha}_i \beta_i \right) \text{id}_{\llbracket \mathbf{r} \rrbracket} = 0_{\llbracket \mathbf{r}_2 \rrbracket, \llbracket \mathbf{r}_1 \rrbracket}
\end{aligned}$$

- $\Gamma \vdash u \ t : Q_2$. The interpretation is an isometry by composition of isometries. The orthogonality is covered by either Lemma 2.44, because a unitary is in particular an isometry, or Lemma 2.61, similarly to the previous points.

□

Providing an interpretation that fits the expectations from quantum physics is meaningful, but not completely satisfying. We thus prove a stronger link between the syntax and the semantics through an equational theory.

2.5. Equational Theory. The main equational theory of our language is given in Figure 14, with the rules of reflexivity, symmetry and transitivity given in Figure 11, linear algebraic identities are given in Figure 12, and congruence identities are given in Figure 13.

Remark 2.64. Among the equational rules presented in this section, only the equations in Figure 14 provide an operational account of the language. They can be seen as a reduction system from left to right. On the other hand, the equations in Figure 12 show that the algebraic power of Hilbert spaces and isometries can be captured within the type system.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\ell: \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ is a bijection} \quad \Gamma \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i): Q}{\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i) = \Sigma_i(\alpha_{\ell(i)} \cdot t_{\ell(i)}): Q} \text{ (perm)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_{i=1}^n(\alpha_i \cdot t_i): Q \quad \alpha_n = 0}{\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_{i=1}^n(\alpha_i \cdot t_i) = \Sigma_{i=1}^{n-1}(\alpha_i \cdot t_i): Q} \text{ (0.scal)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t: Q}{\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_{i=1}^1(1 \cdot t) = t: Q} \text{ (1.scal)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \Sigma_j(\beta_{ij} \cdot t_j)): Q}{\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \Sigma_j(\beta_{ij} \cdot t_j)) = \Sigma_j((\sum_i \alpha_i \beta_{ij}) \cdot t_j): Q_1} \text{ (fubini)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_{ij}(\alpha_i \beta_{ij} \cdot t_{ij}): Q}{\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \Sigma_j(\beta_{ij} \cdot t_{ij})) = \Sigma_{ij}(\alpha_i \beta_{ij} \cdot t_{ij}): Q_1} \text{ (double)} \\
\\
\frac{\Vdash u: U(Q_1, Q_2) \quad \Gamma \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i): Q_1}{\Gamma \vdash u \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i) = \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot u t_i): Q_2} \text{ (u.linear)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i): Q_1}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inl } \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i) = \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \text{inl } t_i): Q_1 \oplus Q_2} \text{ (\iota.linear}_1\text{)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i): Q_2}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inr } \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i) = \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \text{inr } t_i): Q_1 \oplus Q_2} \text{ (\iota.linear}_2\text{)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash t: Q_1 \quad \Gamma_2 \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i): Q_2}{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash t \otimes (\Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i)) = \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t \otimes t_i): A \otimes Q_2} \text{ (\otimes.linear}_1\text{)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma_1 \vdash t: Q_2 \quad \Gamma \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i): Q_1}{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash (\Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i)) \otimes t = \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i \otimes t): A \otimes Q_2} \text{ (\otimes.linear}_2\text{)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i): \text{qnat}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{S } \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i) = \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \text{S } t_i): \text{qnat}} \text{ (S.linear)}
\end{array}$$

FIGURE 12. Vector space and linear applications equational rules.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 = t_2: Q_1}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inl } t_1 = \text{inl } t_2: Q_1 \oplus Q_2} \text{ (\iota.eq}_1\text{)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 = t_2: Q_2}{\Gamma \vdash \text{inr } t_1 = \text{inr } t_2: Q_1 \oplus Q_2} \text{ (\iota.eq}_2\text{)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 = t_2: Q_1 \quad \Gamma' \vdash t: Q_2}{\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash t_1 \otimes t = t_2 \otimes t: Q_1 \otimes Q_2} \text{ (\otimes.eq}_1\text{)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 = t_2: Q_2 \quad \Gamma' \vdash t: Q_1}{\Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash t \otimes t_1 = t \otimes t_2: Q_1 \otimes Q_2} \text{ (\otimes.eq}_2\text{)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 = t_2: \text{qnat}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{S } t_1 = \text{S } t_2: \text{qnat}} \text{ (S.eq)} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 = t_2: Q_1 \quad \Vdash u: Q_1 \mapsto Q_2}{\Gamma \vdash u t_1 = u t_2: Q_2} \text{ (u.eq)} \\
\\
\frac{\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i): Q \quad \forall i, \Gamma \vdash t_i = t'_i: Q}{\Gamma \vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t_i) = \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot t'_i): Q} \text{ (\Sigma.eq)}
\end{array}$$

FIGURE 13. Congruence equational rules of quantum control.

Equations and formation rules. We start by proving that the equational theory presented is sound with the formation rules of the language. In other words, we show that if two terms

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\vdash b': Q_1 \quad \Vdash \{ \mid b_1 \mapsto e_1 \dots \mid b_n \mapsto e_n \} : U(Q_1, Q_2) \quad \text{match}(\sigma, b_i, b')}{\vdash \{ \mid b_1 \mapsto e_1 \dots \mid b_n \mapsto e_n \} \quad b' = \sigma(e_i) : Q_2} (u.\beta) \\
\\
\frac{\vdash u \quad b = v : Q_2}{\vdash u^* \quad v = b : Q_1} (u.inv) \quad \frac{\Vdash u_1 : U(Q_1, Q_2) \quad \Vdash u_2 : U(Q_2, Q_3) \quad \Gamma \vdash b : Q_1}{\Gamma \vdash (u_2 \circ u_1) \quad b = u_2 (u_1 \quad b) : Q_3} (u.comp) \\
\\
\frac{\Vdash u_1 : U(Q_1, Q_3) \quad \Vdash u_2 : U(Q_2, Q_4) \quad \vdash b_1 : Q_1 \quad \vdash b_2 : Q_2}{\vdash (u_1 \otimes u_2) \quad (b_1 \otimes b_2) = (u_1 \quad b_1) \otimes (u_2 \quad b_2) : Q_3 \otimes Q_4} (u.\otimes) \\
\\
\frac{\Vdash u_1 : U(Q_1, Q_3) \quad \Vdash u_2 : U(Q_2, Q_4) \quad \vdash b : Q_1}{\vdash (u_1 \oplus u_2) \quad (\text{inl } b) = \text{inl } (u_1 \quad b) : Q_3 \oplus Q_4} (u.\oplus_1) \\
\\
\frac{\Vdash u_1 : U(Q_1, Q_3) \quad \Vdash u_2 : U(Q_2, Q_4) \quad \vdash b : Q_2}{\vdash (u_1 \oplus u_2) \quad (\text{inr } b) = \text{inl } (u_2 \quad b) : Q_3 \oplus Q_4} (u.\oplus_2) \\
\\
\frac{\Vdash u : U(Q, Q) \quad \vdash b : Q}{\vdash (\text{ctrl } u) \quad ((\text{inl } *) \otimes b) = (\text{inl } *) \otimes b : \text{qbit} \otimes Q} (u.ctrl_1) \\
\\
\frac{\Vdash u : U(Q, Q) \quad \vdash b : Q}{\vdash (\text{ctrl } u) \quad ((\text{inr } *) \otimes b) = (\text{inr } *) \otimes (u \quad b) : \text{qbit} \otimes Q} (u.ctrl_2)
\end{array}$$

FIGURE 14. Computational equational rules of quantum control.

are equal in our theory, they are both well-formed. To do so, we need to show that equality between terms preserve orthogonality.

Lemma 2.65. *Given two terms t_1 and t_2 such that $t_1 \perp t_2$ and $\Gamma \vdash t_1 = t'_1 : Q$, then $t'_1 \perp t_2$.*

Proof. By induction on the rules of the equational theory. \square

The proof of the next proposition heavily relies on the previous lemma. Indeed, to prove that a linear combination is well-formed, one needs to prove that all the terms involved in the linear combination are pairwise orthogonal.

Proposition 2.66. *If $\Gamma \vdash t_1 = t_2 : Q$ is well-formed, then $\Gamma \vdash t_1 : Q$ and $\Gamma \vdash t_2 : Q$ also are.*

Proof. By induction on the rules of the equational theory. \square

Bases. As expected, and thanks to the equational theory, an orthogonal decomposition has properties similar to those of linear algebraic bases: in a Hilbert space, any vector can be written as a combination of elements of a basis. We start by proving that any expression is equal to a combination of basis values.

Lemma 2.67. *Given a well-formed closed expression $\vdash e : Q$, there exists I a set of indices, $(b_i)_{i \in I}$ a family of basis values, $(\alpha_i)_{i \in I}$ a family of complex numbers, such that $\vdash e = \sum_i (\alpha_i \cdot b_i) : Q$.*

Proof. The proof is done by induction on $\vdash e : Q$.

- $\vdash * : I$. Nothing to do.

- $\vdash e_1 \otimes e_2 : Q_1 \otimes Q_2$. The induction hypothesis gives $I, (b_i^1)$ and (α_i) , and $J, (b_j^2)$ and (β_j) , such that $\vdash e_1 = \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot b_i^1) : Q_1$ and $\vdash e_2 = \Sigma_j(\beta_j \cdot b_j^2) : Q_2$. Thus, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \vdash e_1 \otimes e_2 \\
&= (\Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot b_i^1)) \otimes (\Sigma_j(\beta_j \cdot b_j^2)) : Q_1 \otimes Q_2 && \text{(induction hypothesis.)} \\
&= \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot b_i^1 \otimes (\Sigma_j(\beta_j \cdot b_j^2))) : Q_1 \otimes Q_2 && (\otimes.\text{linear}_2) \\
&= \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \Sigma_j(\beta_j \cdot b_i^1 \otimes b_j^2)) : Q_1 \otimes Q_2 && (\otimes.\text{linear}_1) \\
&= \Sigma_{ij}(\alpha_i \beta_j \cdot b_i^1 \otimes b_j^2) : Q_1 \otimes Q_2 && (\text{double})
\end{aligned}$$

- $\vdash \mathbf{inl} \ e : Q_1 \oplus Q_2$. The induction hypothesis gives $\vdash e = \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot b_i) : Q_1$, and observe that $\vdash \mathbf{inl} \ \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot b_i) = \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \mathbf{inl} \ b_i) : Q_1 \oplus Q_2$.
- $\vdash \mathbf{inr} \ e : Q_1 \oplus Q_2$ has the same conclusion.
- $\vdash \mathbf{S} \ e : \mathbf{qnat}$ is similar to the previous point.
- $\vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot e_i) : Q$. The induction hypothesis gives (β_{ij}) and (b_j) (the b does not depend in i without loss of generality, because $0 \cdot b$ can be added to any sum term t , as long as b is orthogonal to t). Finally, we have $\vdash \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \Sigma_j(\beta_{ij} \cdot b_j)) = \Sigma_j((\sum_i \alpha_i \beta_{ij}) \cdot b_j) : Q$.

□

Remark 2.68. The resulting term in the previous lemma, written $\Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot b_i)$ is a value if the basis values are correctly ordered and if all the scalar are non zero. Thanks to the (perm) and (0.scal) rules in Fig. 12, we can assume so. Thus, the lemma above shows that expressions have a unique normal form.

We can then generalise to any orthogonal decomposition, with the help of substitutions.

Lemma 2.69. *Given $\text{ONB}^e_Q S$, where all elements of S are well-formed, and a well-formed closed expression $\vdash e : Q$, there exists I a set of indices, $(s_i)_{i \in I}$ a family of elements of S , $(\alpha_i)_{i \in I}$ a family of complex numbers and $(\sigma_i)_{i \in I}$ a family of valuations such that $\vdash e = \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot \sigma_i(s_i)) : Q$.*

Proof. This is proven by induction on ONB. The previous lemma gives a term equal to e in the equational theory written as a finite sum of basis values $\Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot b_i)$.

- $\text{ONB}^e_Q(\{x\})$. The substitution $\sigma = \{x \mapsto e\}$ is suitable with $e = \sigma(x)$.
- $\text{ONB}^e_I(\{*\})$. Nothing to do.
- $\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1 \oplus Q_2} S \boxplus T$. Each b_i is either $\mathbf{inl} \ b'_i$, with gives a suitable substitution σ_i and $s_i \in S$, thus $\mathbf{inl} \ s_i \in S \boxplus T$, or b_i is $\mathbf{inr} \ b'_i$, giving suitable substitution σ_i and $s_i \in T$, thus $\mathbf{inr} \ s_i \in S \boxplus T$; all this by induction hypothesis.
- $\text{ONB}^e_{Q_1 \otimes Q_2} S$. Each b_i is of the form $b'_i \otimes b''_i$, the induction hypothesis gives suitable $\sigma'_i, s'_i, \sigma''_i, s''_i$, that can be assembled into $\sigma_i = \sigma'_i \cup \sigma''_i$ and $s_i = s'_i \otimes s''_i$.
- $\text{ONB}^e_{\mathbf{qnat}} S^{\oplus 0}$. Each b_i is either $\mathbf{0}$, for which there is nothing to do, or $\mathbf{S} \ b'_i$, in which case the induction hypothesis concludes.
- $\text{ONB}^e_{Q_2} S^\beta$. First, we show that each $s_i \in S$ can be written as a linear combination of elements of S^β . Indeed, in the equational theory:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{s \in S}(\bar{\beta}_{s, s_i} \cdot \Sigma_{s' \in S}(\beta_{s, s'} \cdot s')) &= \Sigma_{s' \in S} \left(\sum_{s \in S} \bar{\beta}_{s, s_i} \beta_{s, s'} \right) \cdot s' \\
&= \Sigma_{s' \in S}(\delta_{s'=s_i} \cdot s') = s_i
\end{aligned}$$

the conclusion is then direct.

□

Progress. The following lemma is our equivalent to progress, and involves both directions: the application of a unitary to a value reduces to a value, and given a unitary and a value, there exists a value that is the inverse image of the latter.

Lemma 2.70. *Given $\Vdash u: U(Q_1, Q_2)$, we have the following:*

- for all $\vdash e: Q_1$, there exists $\vdash v: Q_2$ such that $\vdash u\ e = v: Q_2$;
- for all $\vdash e: Q_2$, there exists $\vdash v: Q_1$ such that $\vdash u\ v = e: Q_2$.

Proof. First, observe that terms are taken up to vector space identities, and up to linearity of unitaries. Thus, if $e = \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot b_i)$, we have $u\ e = \Sigma_i(\alpha_i \cdot u\ b_i)$, and this shows that we can work with $u\ b$ with b a basis value without loss of generality. The equivalent statement to the one we prove is: given $\Vdash u: U(Q_1, Q_2)$ and $\vdash b: Q_1$ a basis value, there exists $\vdash v: Q_2$ such that $\vdash u\ b = v: Q_1$. A similar observation can be done for u . This is proven by induction on the judgement $\Vdash u: U(Q_1, Q_2)$.

- If $\Vdash \{ \mid b_1 \mapsto e_1 \dots \mid b_n \mapsto e_n \} : U(Q_1, Q_2)$. Lemma 2.18 provides a b_i that matches with b and a substitution σ that fits this match. Thus, we have $\vdash u\ b = \sigma(v_i): Q_2$ with $\vdash \sigma(v_i): Q_2$. On the other hand, Lemma 2.69 provides three families (v'_j) that can have multiple copies of the (v_i) , (α_j) and σ_j such that $u = \Sigma_j(\alpha_j \cdot \sigma_j(v'_j))$, and note that $\vdash \{ \mid b_1 \mapsto e_1 \dots \mid b_n \mapsto e_n \} \Sigma_j(\alpha_j \cdot \sigma_j(b'_j)) = \Sigma_j(\alpha_j \cdot \sigma_j(v_j)): Q_2$ where b'_j is a b_i when v'_j is v_i ; and this is because given a substitution σ that fits a b_i , $\vdash \{ \mid b_1 \mapsto e_1 \dots \mid b_n \mapsto e_n \} \sigma(b_i) = \sigma(v_i): Q_2$.
- If $\Vdash u^*: U(Q_2, Q_1)$. Given $\vdash v: Q_2$, the induction hypothesis gives $\vdash v': Q_1$ such that $\vdash u\ v = v': Q_2$, and thus $\vdash u^* v' = v: Q_1$. Moreover, given $\vdash w: Q_1$, the induction hypothesis gives $\vdash w': Q_2$ such that $\vdash u\ w' = w: Q_2$, and thus $\vdash u^* w = w': Q_1$.
- If $\Vdash u_2 \circ u_1: Q_1 \mapsto Q_3$. The induction hypothesis gives us v_1 such that $\vdash u_1\ b = v_1: Q_2$ and then v_2 such that $\vdash u_2\ v_1 = v_2: Q_3$, which ensures the result. A related reasoning proves the second point.
- If $\Vdash u_1 \otimes u_2: U(Q_1 \otimes Q'_1, Q_2 \otimes Q'_2)$. There are two similar cases, namely **inl** b and **inr** b . In the first case, the induction hypothesis gives v_1 such that $\vdash u_1\ b = v_1: Q_2$, thus $\vdash (u_1 \oplus u_2) (\text{inl } b) = \text{inl } v_1: Q_2 \otimes Q'_2$. The other case is similar. A related reasoning proves the second point.
- If $\Vdash u_1 \oplus u_2: U(Q_1 \otimes Q'_1, Q_2 \otimes Q'_2)$. We write $b_1 \otimes b_2$ for b , and the induction hypothesis provides v_1 and v_2 such that $\vdash u_1\ b_1 = v_1: Q_2$ and $\vdash u_2\ b_2 = v_2: Q'_2$, ensuring that $\vdash (u_1 \otimes u_2) (b_1 \otimes b_2) = v_1 \otimes v_2: Q_2 \otimes Q'_2$. A related reasoning proves the second point.
- If $\Vdash \text{ctrl } u: U(\text{qbit} \otimes Q, \text{qbit} \otimes Q)$. In the case **(inl *)** $\otimes b$, there is nothing to do. The other case is **(inr *)** $\otimes b$, and the induction hypothesis gives v such that $\vdash u\ b = v: Q$, and then $\vdash (\text{ctrl } u) ((\text{inr } *) \otimes b) = (\text{inr } *) \otimes v: \text{qbit} \otimes Q$. A related reasoning proves the second point.

□

Normalisation. We have proven that unitary applications progress and reduce to values, if one wishes to have an operational point of view. This allows use to prove, with the same operational view, that the system strongly normalises; this means that any term t eventually reduces to a value.

Lemma 2.71. *Given $\vdash t : Q$, there exists $\vdash v : Q$ such that $\vdash t = v : Q$.*

Proof. This is proven by induction on the formation rules of $\vdash t : Q$.

- The cases $*$, x , 0 and sum are straightforward.
- In the case $t_1 \otimes t_2$, the induction hypothesis gives corresponding v_1 and v_2 , that ensure $\vdash t_1 \otimes t_2 = v_1 \otimes v_2 : Q_1 \otimes Q_2$.
- In the case $\text{inx } t$, the induction hypothesis provides v such that $\vdash t = v : Q_i$, thus $\vdash \text{inx } t = \text{inx } v : Q_1 \oplus Q_2$.
- In the case $S t$, the induction hypothesis provides v such that $\vdash t = v : \text{qnat}$, thus $\vdash S t = S v : \text{qnat}$.
- In the case $u t$, the induction hypothesis gives v such that $\vdash t = v : Q_1$. The previous lemma, Lemma 2.70, provides v' such that $\vdash u v = v' : Q_2$, thus $\vdash t = v' : Q_2$.

□

Completeness. Finally, we prove a strong link between the denotational semantics and the equational theory, namely that an equality statement in one is also an equality statement in the other. We start by showing soundness, meaning that two terms equal in the equational theory have the same denotational interpretation.

Proposition 2.72. *Given $\Gamma \vdash t_1 = t_2 : Q$, then $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash t_1 : Q \rrbracket = \llbracket \Gamma \vdash t_2 : Q \rrbracket$.*

Proof. By induction on the rules of the equational theory. The only non trivial case was done within Proposition 2.60. □

We prove then completeness, starting with terms without unitary functions.

Lemma 2.73 (Completeness of values). *Given $\vdash v_1 : Q$ and $\vdash v_2 : Q$, if $\llbracket \vdash v_1 : Q \rrbracket = \llbracket \vdash v_2 : Q \rrbracket$, then $\vdash v_1 = v_2 : Q$.*

Proof. This is proven by induction on $\vdash v_1 : Q$.

- The cases for $*$ and 0 are straightforward.
- If $v_1 = b_1 \otimes b'_1$ with type $Q_2 \otimes Q_2$, then also $v_2 = b_2 \otimes b'_2$, and $\llbracket b_1 \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket b'_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket b_2 \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket b'_2 \rrbracket$, thus $\llbracket b_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket b_2 \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket b'_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket b'_2 \rrbracket$, the induction hypothesis ensures that $\vdash b_1 = b_2 : Q_1$ and $\vdash b'_1 = b'_2 : Q_2$, and thus $\vdash b_1 \otimes b'_1 = b_2 \otimes b'_2 : Q_1 \otimes Q_2$.
- If $v_1 = \text{inx } b_1$ of type $Q_1 \oplus Q_2$, with $\llbracket v_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket v_2 \rrbracket$, necessarily $v_2 = \text{inx } b_2$, and $\iota_l^{Q_1, Q_2} \circ \llbracket b_1 \rrbracket = \iota_l^{Q_1, Q_2} \circ \llbracket b_2 \rrbracket$, thus $(\iota_l^{Q_1, Q_2})^* \circ \iota_l^{Q_1, Q_2} \circ \llbracket b_1 \rrbracket = (\iota_l^{Q_1, Q_2})^* \circ \iota_l^{Q_1, Q_2} \circ \llbracket b_2 \rrbracket$ which ends with $\llbracket b_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket b_2 \rrbracket$, and the induction hypothesis gives that $\vdash b_1 = b_2 : Q_i$, and thus $\vdash \text{inx } b_1 = \text{inx } b_2 : Q_1 \oplus Q_2$.
- Else, with type Q , $v_1 = \sum_i (\alpha_i \cdot b_i^1)$ with the (b_i^1) that are pairwise orthogonal, and $v_2 = \sum_j (\beta_j \cdot b_j^2)$ with the (b_j^2) that are also pairwise orthogonal. We know that

$$\llbracket v_1 \rrbracket = \sum_i \alpha_i \llbracket b_i^1 \rrbracket = \sum_j \beta_j \llbracket b_j^2 \rrbracket = \llbracket v_2 \rrbracket.$$

Thus, for all $\vdash b : Q$, $\llbracket b \rrbracket^* \circ \sum_i \alpha_i \llbracket b_i^1 \rrbracket = \llbracket b \rrbracket^* \circ \sum_j \beta_j \llbracket b_j^2 \rrbracket$; by orthogonality, we have $\llbracket b \rrbracket^* \circ \sum_i \alpha_i \llbracket b_i^1 \rrbracket = \alpha_k \llbracket b_k^1 \rrbracket$ for some k , and $\llbracket b \rrbracket^* \circ \sum_j \beta_j \llbracket b_j^2 \rrbracket = \beta_{k'} \llbracket b_{k'}^2 \rrbracket$ for some k' . Thus, $\alpha_k \llbracket b_k^1 \rrbracket = \beta_{k'} \llbracket b_{k'}^2 \rrbracket$, and because they are basis values, we have $\llbracket b_k^1 \rrbracket = \llbracket b_{k'}^2 \rrbracket$, and the induction hypothesis ensures that $\vdash b_k^1 = b_{k'}^2 : Q$. Note that this is done for all $\vdash b : Q$, and thus $\vdash v_1 = v_2 : Q$.

□

We then prove the final result of this section, namely, completeness on closed terms, meaning that the equality statement of the equational theory and of the denotational semantics on closed terms are equivalent.

Theorem 2.74 (Completeness). $\vdash t_1 = t_2 : Q$ iff $\llbracket \vdash t_1 : Q \rrbracket = \llbracket \vdash t_2 : Q \rrbracket$.

Proof. We prove both directions.

- For the implication $\vdash t_1 = t_2 : Q$ to $\llbracket \vdash t_1 : Q \rrbracket = \llbracket \vdash t_2 : Q \rrbracket$, see Proposition 2.72.
- The other direction uses Lemma 2.71, the equivalent of strong normalisation, that gives v_1 and v_2 such that $\vdash t_1 = v_2 : Q$ and $\vdash t_2 = v_2 : Q$. Our hypothesis is that $\llbracket t_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket t_2 \rrbracket$, and thus $\llbracket v_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket t_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket t_2 \rrbracket = \llbracket v_2 \rrbracket$. Lemma 2.73 gives then that $\vdash v_1 = v_2 : Q$ and transitivity ensures that $\vdash t_1 = t_2 : Q$.

□

3. COMBINING CLASSICAL AND QUANTUM CONTROL

This section lays down the syntax and semantics of the main calculus, which combines the quantum control fragment with a classically controlled layer, a variant of a call-by-value linear lambda-calculus. The subsystem which we presented in the previous section is designed to represent pure quantum information and computation, whereas in this section, we are concerned with mixed quantum information and computation. Our denotational approach towards this uses von Neumann algebras, which provide an appropriate mathematical setting to achieve this treatment. Operationally, this is achieved by adapting the configurations (also called closures) $(|\psi\rangle, \ell, M)$ from an effectful quantum lambda-calculus, e.g., [CW16, SV⁺09], by replacing the quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ with a pure term t , replacing the linking function ℓ with a unitary u that can be described via our syntax and which represents a suitable permutation, and finally by defining suitable formation conditions for the configuration.

We refer to this system as the “main calculus”, because it allows us to integrate the pure quantum subsystem within it, but it also allows us to represent classical information, quantum measurements and mixed-state quantum computation.

3.1. Syntax and Typing Rules.

Types. The *types* of the main calculus, ranged over by capital Latin letters (e.g., A, B) are given in Figure 15. We write I for the unit type, $A + B$ for sum types (which allow us to handle classical control), $A \otimes B$ for pair types, $A \multimap B$ for higher-order linear function types, and $!A$ for exponential types (in the sense of linear logic). All types except Nat and $\mathcal{B}(Q)$ are standard in a system for a classical call-by-value linear lambda-calculus. Nat is a ground type representing classical natural numbers and $\mathcal{B}(Q)$ is the type that represents *mixed state quantum* computation on the Hilbert space determined by the type Q . As we see later, this type plays an important role by introducing quantum and probabilistic effects into

| | | |
|----------|-----------|--|
| (VARS) | x, y, z | |
| (TYPES) | A, B | $::= I \mid A + B \mid A \otimes B \mid !A \mid A \multimap B \mid \text{Nat} \mid \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q})$ |
| (TERMS) | L, M, N | $::= * \mid x \mid \text{inl}(M) \mid \text{inr}(N) \mid \text{case } L \text{ of } \{\text{inl}(x) \rightarrow M, \text{inr}(y) \rightarrow N\}$ $\mid M \otimes N \mid \text{let } x \otimes y = M \text{ in } N \mid \text{lift}(M) \mid \text{force}(M)$ $\mid \lambda x. M \mid M N$ $\mid \text{zero} \mid \text{succ}(M) \mid \text{match } L \text{ with } \{\text{zero} \rightarrow M, \text{succ}(x) \rightarrow N\}$ $\mid \text{pure}(\mathbf{t}) \mid \text{meas}(M) \mid \mathcal{B}(u)(M)$ $\mid \text{let } \mathcal{B}(z) = M \text{ in } N \mid \text{let } \mathcal{B}(x \otimes y) = M \text{ in } N$ |
| (VALUES) | V, W | $::= * \mid x \mid \text{inl}(V) \mid \text{inr}(W) \mid V \otimes W \mid \text{lift}(M) \mid \lambda x. M$ $\mid \text{zero} \mid \text{succ}(V)$ |

FIGURE 15. Syntax of the classically controlled system.

the system. The modality \mathcal{B} is inspired from the denotational model, where $\mathcal{B}(H)$ represents the von Neumann algebra of bounded operators on the Hilbert space H .

Terms. *Terms* (and values) of the calculus are described in Figure 15. They are either standard linear lambda-calculus terms, terms representing natural numbers, or terms that we introduce to model the interaction of the classical control fragment with the quantum control fragment. We refer the reader to [SV⁺09] for a detailed exposition on linear lambda-calculus. *zero* and *succ* are constructors for natural numbers and *match* L with $\{\text{zero} \rightarrow M, \text{succ}(x) \rightarrow N\}$ is the corresponding pattern-match. The term *pure*(\mathbf{t}) models the preparation of a pure quantum state represented by the quantum term \mathbf{t} . Measurement is modelled by the term *meas*(M). The term $\mathcal{B}(u)(M)$ represents the application of the unitary u to a term M . Additionally, we have two syntactic constructs to model the isomorphism between the types $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}_1 \otimes \mathbf{Q}_2)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}_1) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}_2)$: the term *let* $\mathcal{B}(z) = M$ *in* N allows one to construct a term of type $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}_1 \otimes \mathbf{Q}_2)$ from a term of type $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}_1) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}_2)$ and the term *let* $\mathcal{B}(x \otimes y) = M$ *in* N deals with the opposite direction. This isomorphism arises because the functor $\mathcal{B}(\cdot)$ used in the denotational model is *strict monoidal*. Both constructs are necessary to allow the language to manipulate composed quantum systems and also terms possibly representing *entangled states*.

Type system. *Typing contexts* (ranged over by symbols $\Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2$) are finite sequences $\Delta \triangleq x_1 : A_1, \dots, x_n : A_n$ mapping variables to types. We use the notation $!\Delta$ for contexts of the form $x_1 : !A_1, \dots, x_n : !A_n$. *Typing judgements* have the form $\Delta \vdash M : A$ and follow a linear typing discipline to deal with quantum data. The typing rules are given in Figure 16 where, as usual, Σ_1, Σ_2 denotes the disjoint union of Σ_1 and Σ_2 . Classical bits correspond to the type *bit* $\triangleq I + I$ and mixed state qubits have type *qbit* $\triangleq \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{qbit})$. Note that we interchangeably use contexts of the form Δ and $!\Delta, \Sigma_1$. The former is used to lay down rules which do not require a distinction between a *linear* typing context and a non-linear one. We use the latter when a rule modifies the context, and it is necessary to differentiate between the *linear* part of the typing context and the *non-linear* part. The rule for the term *pure*(\mathbf{t}) introduces a state \mathbf{t} from the quantum control fragment as a term of type $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q})$ into the main calculus. The typing rule for measurement maps a term M of quantum type $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q})$ to a

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{! \Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash L : A + B \quad ! \Delta, \Sigma_2, x : A \vdash M : C \quad ! \Delta, \Sigma_2, y : B \vdash N : C}{! \Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash \text{case } L \text{ of } \{ \text{inl}(x) \rightarrow M, \text{inr}(y) \rightarrow N \} : C} \\
\frac{\Delta, x : A \vdash M : B \quad ! \Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash M : A \multimap B \quad ! \Delta, \Sigma_2 \vdash N : A}{\Delta \vdash \lambda x. M : A \multimap B} \quad \frac{! \Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash M N : B}{! \Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash L : \text{Nat} \quad ! \Delta, \Sigma_2 \vdash M : A \quad ! \Delta, \Sigma_2, x : \text{Nat} \vdash N : A} \quad \frac{\cdot \vdash t : Q}{! \Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash \text{match } L \text{ with } \{ \text{zero} \rightarrow M, \text{succ}(x) \rightarrow N \} : A} \quad \frac{! \Delta \vdash \text{pure}(t) : \mathcal{B}(Q)}{\Delta \vdash M : \mathcal{B}(Q)} \\
\frac{\Delta \vdash M : \mathcal{B}(Q) \quad \Vdash u : U(Q_1, Q_2) \quad ! \Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash M : \mathcal{B}(Q_1)}{\Delta \vdash \text{meas}(M) : \overline{Q}} \quad \frac{! \Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash \mathcal{B}(u)(M) : \mathcal{B}(Q_2)}{! \Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash M : \mathcal{B}(Q_1) \otimes \mathcal{B}(Q_2)} \quad \frac{! \Delta, \Sigma_2, z : \mathcal{B}(Q_1 \otimes Q_2) \vdash N : A}{! \Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash \text{let } \mathcal{B}(z) = M \text{ in } N : A} \\
\frac{! \Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash M : \mathcal{B}(Q_1 \otimes Q_2) \quad ! \Delta, \Sigma_2, x : \mathcal{B}(Q_1), y : \mathcal{B}(Q_2) \vdash N : A}{! \Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash \text{let } \mathcal{B}(x \otimes y) = M \text{ in } N : A}
\end{array}$$

FIGURE 16. Typing rules for terms (excerpt).

term $\text{meas}(M)$ of classical type \overline{Q} , where the type \overline{Q} is defined inductively on the structure of the pure quantum type Q :

$$\overline{I} \triangleq I, \quad \overline{Q_1 \otimes Q_2} \triangleq \overline{Q_1} \otimes \overline{Q_2}, \quad \overline{Q_1 \oplus Q_2} \triangleq \overline{Q_1} + \overline{Q_2}, \quad \overline{\text{qnat}} \triangleq \text{Nat}.$$

This gives the classical analogue of the type Q , e.g., $\overline{\text{qbit}} = \text{bit}$. For a quantum basis term b of type Q , \overline{b} (defined below) denotes its translation to a classical value of type \overline{Q} , which we use to represent measurement outcomes.

$$\overline{*} \triangleq *, \quad \overline{b_1 \otimes b_2} \triangleq \overline{b_1} \otimes \overline{b_2}, \quad \overline{\text{inl } b} \triangleq \text{inl}(\overline{b}), \quad \overline{0} \triangleq \text{zero}, \quad \overline{\text{S } b} \triangleq \text{succ}(\overline{b}).$$

3.2. Operational Semantics.

Quantum configurations. We lay down the operational semantics of the calculus using an adaptation of the notion of a *quantum configuration* from quantum lambda-calculi ([CW16, SV⁺09]).

Definition 3.1 (Quantum Configuration). Let Conf be the set of *quantum configurations* $C \triangleq (t, u_\sigma, M)$, where:

- $t \in \text{Terms}$ represents a *pure quantum state*;
- $u_\sigma \in \text{Unitaries}$ represents a symmetric monoidal isomorphism;
- $M \in \text{TERMS}$ is a term from the main calculus.

In the above definition, we can think of the quantum term t as representing a quantum state, because the quantum control fragment ensures that t can be rewritten (in its equational theory) to a quantum value (Lemma 2.71). Next, u_σ permutes the components of t so that they appear in the same order as variables that represent them in M . We slightly abuse terminology and refer to u_σ as a permutation, but it is meant to be understood as a canonical symmetric monoidal isomorphism (see Proposition 2.59). If we fix the domain and codomain of u_σ , then the essential data is given by a choice of permutation σ and this makes it easier to understand how each unitary acts on the coordinates, and the contextual rules formulation becomes precise. Note that, thanks to Proposition 2.59, the pure quantum syntax is expressive enough to represent all the monoidal permutations that we need in the sequel.

Example 3.2. Consider the quantum configuration $(\mathbf{t}, u_{id}, x \otimes y)$, where we have $\mathbf{t} \triangleq * \otimes (1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle + 1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |1\rangle \otimes |1\rangle)$ and $u_{id} \triangleq \{ | * \otimes \mathbf{w} \otimes \mathbf{z} \mapsto \mathbf{w} \otimes \mathbf{z} \}$ is a unitary with type $\Vdash u_{id} : U(\mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{qbit} \otimes \mathbf{qbit}, \mathbf{qbit} \otimes \mathbf{qbit})$. It conveys the information that the variable x in $x \otimes y$ keeps track of the first qubit in \mathbf{t} and that the variable y keeps track of the second one. Whereas in the configuration $(\mathbf{t}, u_{swap}, x \otimes y)$ with $u_{swap} \triangleq \{ | * \otimes \mathbf{w} \otimes \mathbf{z} \mapsto \mathbf{z} \otimes \mathbf{w} \}$, the variable x keeps track of the second qubit and y of the first one. Note that, due to quantum entanglement, the term \mathbf{t} cannot be decomposed into a non-trivial tensor product, and the variables x and y should be thought of as identifying qubit components of \mathbf{t} , instead of storing quantum data themselves.

A quantum configuration $\mathcal{V} = (\mathbf{v}, u_\sigma, V)$, when both the quantum term \mathbf{v} and term V are values, is called a *value configuration*. For example, $(|0\rangle, u_{id}, x)$ is a value configuration. A quantum configuration $\mathcal{SV} = (\mathbf{v}, u_\sigma, M)$, where \mathbf{v} is a quantum value, is a *semi-value configuration*. We write \mathbf{VConf} (resp. \mathbf{SVConf}) for the set of (resp. semi-)value configurations. The reason we introduce semi-value configurations, is because they allow us to define our operational semantics for the main calculus modulo equality of the pure quantum terms \mathbf{t} (analogous to the quantum lambda-calculus). We already proved that values \mathbf{v} are normal forms for the pure terms (Lemma 2.71), so this makes them a natural choice.

Definition 3.3. A quantum configuration $(\mathbf{t}, u_\sigma, M)$ is *well-formed* with type A, written as $(\mathbf{t}, u_\sigma, M) : A$ if the following judgments can be derived:

- $\cdot \vdash \mathbf{t} : \mathbf{Q}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{Q}_n$;
- $\cdot \Vdash u_\sigma : U(\mathbf{Q}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{Q}_n, \mathbf{Q}'_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{Q}'_m)$;
- $x_1 : \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}'_1), \dots, x_m : \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}'_m) \vdash M : A$.

We write $\mathbf{WF}_X(A)$ for the set of well-formed configurations in X with type A, where $X \in \{\mathbf{Conf}, \mathbf{VConf}, \mathbf{SVConf}\}$.

Example 3.4. The configuration $((1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |00\rangle + 1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |11\rangle) \otimes |0\rangle, u_{id}, x \otimes y)$ with:

- $\cdot \vdash (1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |00\rangle + 1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |11\rangle) \otimes |0\rangle : \mathbf{qbit}^3$;
- $\cdot \Vdash u_{id} : U(\mathbf{qbit}^3, \mathbf{qbit}^3)$;
- $x : \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{qbit}^2), y : \mathbf{qbit} \vdash x \otimes y : \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{qbit}^2) \otimes \mathbf{qbit}$.

In this configuration, u_{id} is just the identity, x points to the Bell state in \mathbf{t} whereas y points to $|0\rangle$. We have $n = 3, m = 2$, with $\mathbf{Q}_1 = \mathbf{Q}_2 = \mathbf{Q}_3 = \mathbf{qbit}$, $\mathbf{Q}'_1 = \mathbf{qbit}^2$ and $\mathbf{Q}'_2 = \mathbf{qbit}$. The configuration is well-formed.

The above example highlights the need for m and n (from Definition 3.3) to be different values. The intuition behind this difference is that the unitary u_σ partitions the n quantum types into m blocks, where each block is represented by a variable in M . Furthermore, in situations where we wish to combine two such blocks which are not next to each other in the tensor expression of the n types, we allow the possibility of permuting these blocks and merging them so that now two blocks that were initially represented by two variables are represented by one. This is formally expressed in the reduction rules we define next. The role of u_σ in a well-formed configuration is illustrated in Figure 17. The *small-step reduction* $\cdot \rightarrow \cdot \subseteq \mathbf{Conf} \times [0, 1] \times \mathbf{Conf}$ is the relation defined by the rules of Figure 18: $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow_p \mathcal{C}'$ holds when the quantum configuration \mathcal{C} reduces to \mathcal{C}' with probability $p \in [0, 1]$.




FIGURE 17. Graphical representation of a well-formed quantum configuration.

Additionally, we need to consider configurations where the entire state \mathbf{t} is not covered by the variables appearing in M . This is a matter of convenience and technicality for proofs of some of the results that follow. Hence, we define a *well-formed* quantum configuration with *auxiliary types* to account for such configurations. Consequently, the configurations introduced above should be seen as being *total* in a certain sense, whereas the configurations with auxiliary types that we introduce next are more general in that the quantum data which is represented by the first component of the configuration does not have to be entirely covered by the free variables of the term from the main calculus.

Definition 3.5. A quantum configuration $(\mathbf{t}, u_\sigma, M)$ is said to be *well-formed with type A and auxiliary quantum data* of types $[Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k]$, written $(\mathbf{t}, u_\sigma, M) : A[Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k]$, if the following hold:

- $\cdot \vdash \mathbf{t} : Q_1 \otimes \dots \otimes Q_n$ can be derived;
- $\cdot \Vdash u_\sigma : U(Q_1 \otimes \dots \otimes Q_n, Q'_1 \otimes \dots \otimes Q'_{m+k})$ can be derived;
- $x_1 : \mathcal{B}(Q'_1), \dots, x_m : \mathcal{B}(Q'_m) \vdash M : A$ can be derived;
- $[Q'_1, \dots, Q'_{m+k}] = [Q''_1, \dots, Q''_m, Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k]$ as lists of pure quantum types.

$\text{WF}_{\text{Conf}}(A[Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k])$ denotes the set of well-formed configurations wrt type A and auxiliary quantum types $[Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k]$.

The reduction rules along with the unitaries required to state them are given in Figure 18. $\{\mathbf{b}_{ij}\}_{i,j}$ stand for basis terms and s in the reduction rule for $\text{meas}(x)$ corresponds to the position of \mathbf{b}_i in the tensor product appearing in the quantum term. All sums are finite. The unitary $u_{\sigma_{\text{gather}}}$ appearing in the reduction rule for the term $\text{let } \mathcal{B}(z) = x \otimes y \text{ in } N$ merges two consecutive variables into one block, so that now a single variable can represent it. Similarly, in the reduction rule for the term $\text{let } \mathcal{B}(x \otimes y) = z \text{ in } N$, the unitary $u_{\sigma_{\text{divide}}}$ partitions a block into two, so that two variables can represent them. The two rules are symmetric as expected, since these terms only allow switching between types $\mathcal{B}(Q_1 \otimes Q_2)$ and $\mathcal{B}(Q_1) \otimes \mathcal{B}(Q_2)$. The last rule of Figure 18 is a *contextual rule* which holds for any *evaluation context E*. Evaluation contexts are defined by the following grammar:

$$\begin{aligned}
 E &:= [\cdot] \mid E \otimes N \mid V \otimes E \mid \text{let } x \otimes y = E \text{ in } N \mid \text{inl}(E) \mid \text{inr}(E) \\
 &\mid \text{case } E \text{ of } \{ \text{inl}(x) \rightarrow M, \text{inr}(y) \rightarrow N \} \mid \text{force}(E) \mid \text{succ}(E) \mid EN \\
 &\mid VE \mid \text{meas}(E) \mid \mathcal{B}(u)(E) \mid \text{let } \mathcal{B}(z) = E \text{ in } N \mid \text{let } \mathcal{B}(x \otimes y) = E \text{ in } N
 \end{aligned}$$

One of the premises of the contextual rule states that if σ is a permutation which does not act on the same set of indices as σ_1, σ_2 , then we can form a “union” of these permutations by composing an *extension* of the two. For a permutation $\sigma : S \rightarrow S$, we can define its




FIGURE 18. Reduction rules and their unitary permutations.

extension $\sigma^{ext} : S \sqcup S' \rightarrow S \sqcup S'$ by $\sigma^{ext}(s) \triangleq \sigma(s)$, if $s \in S$, $\sigma^{ext}(s') \triangleq s'$, if $s' \in S'$. We now introduce the reduction relation we use to define the operational semantics.

Definition 3.6. The *reduction relation* $\cdot \rightsquigarrow \cdot \subseteq \text{SVConf} \times [0, 1] \times \text{SVConf}$ is defined in the following way: we write $(v, u_\sigma, M) \rightsquigarrow_p (v', u_{\sigma'}, M')$ whenever

$$\frac{\cdot \vdash v = t : Q \quad (t, u_\sigma, M) \rightarrow_p (t', u_{\sigma'}, M') \quad \cdot \vdash t' = v' : Q'}{(v, u_\sigma, M) \rightsquigarrow_p (v', u_{\sigma'}, M')}$$

The intuition behind the above definition is that it allows us to reason modulo equality of the pure terms t , as a consequence of Lemma 2.71.

3.3. Main properties. We show that well-formedness is preserved by the reduction relation $\cdot \rightsquigarrow \cdot$.

Lemma 3.7 (Substitution). *For a value V , if $!\Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash V : A$ and for a term M , $!\Delta, \Sigma_2, x : A \vdash M : B$ then $!\Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash M[V/x] : B$.*

Lemma 3.8 (Substitution for Contexts). *If $!\Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash M : A$ and $!\Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash E[M] : B$, then for $!\Delta, \Sigma'_1 \vdash M' : A$, we have $!\Delta, \Sigma'_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash E[M'] : B$.*

Lemma 3.9 (Preservation for translation). *If $\cdot \vdash v : Q$ then $\cdot \vdash \bar{v} : \bar{Q}$.*

Proof. Proof is by induction on the rules for the translation. \square

Theorem 3.10. *For any $\mathcal{C} \in \text{WF}_{\text{conf}}(A[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k])$, if $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow_p \mathcal{C}'$, for some probability $p \in [0, 1]$, then $\mathcal{C}' \in \text{WF}_{\text{conf}}(A[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k])$.*

Proof. We provide a sketch of the proof here. Proof is by induction on the reduction relation \rightarrow . If \mathcal{C} is a value configuration, then there is no \mathcal{C}' s.t. $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow_p \mathcal{C}'$. Hence, we consider the cases when \mathcal{C} is not a value configuration. Note that without loss of generality, we can assume that \mathcal{C} is of the form (t, u_σ, M) . We give the proof for a few important cases, others follow similarly.

- $\mathcal{C} = (t, u_\sigma, (\lambda x.M) V)$ for term M and value V :

According to the rules in 18, this configuration reduces to $\mathcal{C}' = (t, u_\sigma, M[V/x])$. Since the rule doesn't modify the quantum state, the auxiliary quantum data associated with \mathcal{C}' is the same as that for \mathcal{C} . Since \mathcal{C} is well-formed, we have that $!\Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash (\lambda x.M) V : B$ is a valid typing judgment. The formation rules for such a judgment imply that $!\Delta, x : A, \Sigma_1 \vdash M : B$ and $!\Delta, \Sigma_2 \vdash V : A$ are valid typing judgments. Hence, substitution lemma gives us that $!\Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash M[V/x] : B$ is a valid typing judgment. For a more general configuration $\mathcal{C} = (t, u_\sigma, M N)$ we apply the induction hypothesis along with Lemma 3.8.

- $\mathcal{C} = (t, u_\sigma, \text{pure}(t'))$:

This configuration reduces to $(t \otimes t', u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}} \circ (u_\sigma \otimes u_{id}), x)$. Formation rules of $\text{pure}(t')$, require t' to be a closed term of type Q from the quantum control fragment. Moreover, t is a closed term of type $Q_1 \otimes \dots \otimes Q_{m+k}$. Hence, the formation rules from the quantum control fragment ensure that $\cdot \vdash t \otimes t' : Q_1 \otimes \dots \otimes Q_{m+k} \otimes Q$ is a valid typing judgment. x is the only free variable in the new term, which corresponds to t' . Hence applying $u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}}$ on $t \otimes t'$ ensures that the reduct is well-formed. The auxiliary quantum data in \mathcal{C}' remains unchanged, since x covers t' . Hence the list equation for types holds. Therefore, $(t \otimes t', u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}} \circ (u_\sigma \otimes u_{id}), x)$ is a well-formed configuration of the same type as \mathcal{C} .

- $\mathcal{C} = (t, u_\sigma, \mathcal{B}(u)(z))$ for a unitary u :

This configuration reduces to $((u_\sigma^* \circ (u \otimes id) \circ u_\sigma)t, u_\sigma, z)$. If $\cdot \Vdash u : U(Q_1, Q_2)$, from the typing rules for unitary application it follows that $z : \mathcal{B}(Q_1) \vdash \mathcal{B}(u)(z) : \mathcal{B}(Q_2)$. Since,

$(u_\sigma^* \circ (u \otimes id) \circ u_\sigma)$ applies u to the component of \mathbf{t} that z corresponds to, after reduction, we have $z : \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}_2) \vdash z : \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}_2)$. Moreover, everything else in the quantum term remains unchanged, and hence the term remains well-typed after reduction. Therefore, the quantum configuration obtained after reduction is well-formed.

- $\mathcal{C} = (\Sigma_i p_i \cdot \Sigma_j \alpha_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{b}'_{ij} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{b}_i \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{b}''_{ij}, u_{\sigma_s}, meas(x))$:

This configuration reduces to $\mathcal{C}' = (\Sigma_j \alpha_{mj} \cdot \mathbf{b}'_{mj} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{b}''_{mj}, u_{id}, \overline{\mathbf{b}_m})$ with probability p_m . Note that since \mathcal{C} is well-formed, we have that $\cdot \vdash \Sigma_i p_i \cdot \Sigma_j \alpha_{ij} \cdot \mathbf{b}'_{ij} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{b}_i \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{b}''_{ij} : \mathbf{Q}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{Q}_m \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{Q}_k$ is a valid typing judgment for some quantum types $\mathbf{Q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}_k$. Hence, formation rules of the quantum control fragment ensure that $\cdot \vdash \Sigma_j \alpha_{mj} \cdot \mathbf{b}'_{mj} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{b}''_{mj} : \mathbf{Q}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{Q}_k$ is a valid typing judgment. Furthermore, since we have $x : \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}_s) \vdash meas(x) : \overline{\mathbf{Q}_s}$, and 3.9 gives us $\cdot \vdash \overline{\mathbf{b}_m} : \overline{\mathbf{Q}_s}$, type is preserved for the term. Finally, since the auxiliary quantum data types remain unchanged, we have that \mathcal{C}' is well-formed with the same type as that of \mathcal{C} . \square

Theorem 3.11 (Subject Reduction). *For a configuration $\mathcal{C}_1 \in \text{WF}_{svconf}(A)$, if $\mathcal{C}_1 \rightsquigarrow_p \mathcal{C}_2$ for some probability $p \in [0, 1]$, then $\mathcal{C}_2 \in \text{WF}_{svconf}(A)$.*

Proof. Follows from Theorem 3.10. \square

Next, we show that progress holds. More specifically, a well-formed semi-value configuration \mathcal{C} is either a value configuration or it reduces to a finite number of semi-value configurations with total probability 1, *i.e.* if we have not reached a normal form then the probability to be stuck is 0.

Theorem 3.12. *For a quantum configuration $\mathcal{C} \in \text{WF}_{svconf}(A[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k])$, there are two possibilities:*

- *either $\mathcal{C} \in \text{VConf}$,*
- *or there exists $\mathcal{C}_1 \in \text{WF}_{svconf}(A[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k])$ such that $\mathcal{C} \rightsquigarrow_{p_1} \mathcal{C}_1$.*

*Let $\{\mathcal{C}_i\}_{i \in I}$ be the set of all such distinct (*i.e.*, not α -equivalent) configurations. Then, the set I is finite, and $\Sigma_{i \in I} p_i = 1$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume $\mathcal{C} = (\mathbf{v}, u_\sigma, M)$ for some quantum value \mathbf{v} and term M . Proof proceeds by induction on the typing rule for M . We prove a few cases here, the other cases follow similarly.

- $M = M' N'$:

By the induction hypothesis and rules in Figure 18, we can assume that both M', N' are values. In this case $M = (\lambda x. M'') V$. From the rules in Figure 18, we have that this configuration reduces to $\mathcal{C}_2 = (\mathbf{v}, u_\sigma, M''[V/x])$.

- $M = meas(M')$:

We rewrite the quantum value \mathbf{v} in the first component of the configuration using the rule for \rightsquigarrow_p , and reduce using the rule for measurement in Figure 18. The resulting configuration is a value configuration.

- $M = \mathcal{B}(u)(M)$:

From the rules in Figure 18 and the induction hypothesis, we can assume that M is a value of type $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q})$ for some quantum type \mathbf{Q} . By inspection, it follows that it has to be a variable. Now, we can apply the rule for unitary application in Figure 18, to obtain a configuration of the form $(u_\sigma^* \circ (u \otimes id) \circ u_\sigma \mathbf{t}, u_\sigma, z)$ for appropriate quantum state \mathbf{t} and unitaries u_σ, u . From the equational theory (Lemma 2.71) it follows that the quantum

state can be rewritten to a value, and thus applying the reduction rule for \rightsquigarrow_p , gives us that the resulting configuration is a value configuration.

- $M = \text{pure}(\mathbf{t}')$:

We apply the rule in Figure 18, the reduction rule for \rightsquigarrow_p and Lemma 2.71, to obtain a value configuration. \square

Theorem 3.13 (Progress). *If $\mathcal{C} \in \text{WF}_{\text{svconf}}(A)$, then either $\mathcal{C} \in \text{VConf}$, or there exists $\mathcal{C}_i \in \text{WF}_{\text{svconf}}(A)$ such that $\mathcal{C} \rightsquigarrow_{p_i} \mathcal{C}_i$. Moreover, if $\{\mathcal{C}_i\}_{i \in I}$ is the set of all such distinct (not α -equivalent) configurations, then I is finite, and $\sum_i p_i = 1$.*

Proof. Follows from Theorem 3.12. \square

3.3.1. *Strong Normalisation.* Next, we show that any reduction issued from a well-formed configuration under \rightsquigarrow always terminates in finitely many steps.

In order to prove strong normalisation for the relation \rightsquigarrow , we define another relation \longrightarrow on TERMS of the main calculus, and prove that it strongly normalises. We also show that strong normalisation of \longrightarrow implies strong normalisation of \rightsquigarrow .

Definition 3.14 (Term reduction). $\longrightarrow \in \text{TERMS} \times [0, 1] \times \text{TERMS}$ is defined as follows:

$$\frac{(\mathbf{v}_1, u_{\sigma_1}, M_1) \rightsquigarrow_p (\mathbf{v}_2, u_{\sigma_2}, M_2)}{M_1 \longrightarrow_p M_2}$$

We additionally have a contextual reduction rule for the relation \longrightarrow defined as:

$$\frac{M \longrightarrow_p M'}{E[M] \longrightarrow_p E[M']}$$

Definition 3.15 (Well-typed term). We say a term $M \in \text{TERMS}$ is well-typed of type $A[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k]$ if there exist \mathbf{t}, u_σ such that $(\mathbf{t}, u_\sigma, M)$ is a well-formed configuration of type $A[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k]$. We denote such a term by $M : A[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k]$.

Let \mathcal{SN}_C denote the set of well-formed strongly normalizing quantum configurations under the relation \rightsquigarrow . Let \mathcal{SN}_T denote the set of strongly normalizing terms from the main calculus under the relation \longrightarrow . We denote a reduction path $M \longrightarrow_{p_0} M_1 \longrightarrow_{p_1} \dots \longrightarrow_{p_n} V$ by $M \longrightarrow_* V$.

Lemma 3.16. *For $M \in \mathcal{SN}_T$, if \mathbf{v}, u_σ are such that $\mathcal{C} = (\mathbf{v}, u_\sigma, M)$ is well-formed then $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{SN}_C$.*

To prove strong normalisation of \longrightarrow , corresponding to each type we define the following sets:

- $\mathcal{S}_T[I] \triangleq \{M \mid M \in \mathcal{SN}_T \text{ and } M \longrightarrow_* V \implies V = * : I[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k] \text{ for some } k\}$
- $\mathcal{S}_T[A + B] \triangleq \{M \mid M \in \mathcal{SN}_T \text{ and } M \longrightarrow_* V \implies V = \text{inl}(V) : A + B[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k] \text{ or } V = \text{inr}(W) : A + B[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k] \text{ for some } k\}$
- $\mathcal{S}_T[A \otimes B] \triangleq \{M \mid M \in \mathcal{SN}_T \text{ and } M \longrightarrow_* V \implies V = V \otimes W : A \otimes B[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k] \text{ for some } k\}$
- $\mathcal{S}_T[!A] \triangleq \{M \mid M \in \mathcal{SN}_T \text{ and } M \longrightarrow_* V \implies V = \text{lift}(M') : !A[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k] \text{ for some } k \text{ and } \text{force}(V) \in \mathcal{S}_T[A]\}$
- $\mathcal{S}_T[\text{Nat}] \triangleq \{M \mid M \in \mathcal{SN}_T \text{ and } M \longrightarrow_* V \implies V = \text{zero} : \text{Nat}[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k] \text{ or } V = \text{succ}(V) : \text{Nat}[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k] \text{ for some } k\}$

- $\mathcal{S}_T[A \multimap B] \triangleq \{M \mid M \in \mathcal{SN}_T \text{ and } \forall N \in \mathcal{S}_T[A], MN \in \mathcal{S}_T[B]\}$
- $\mathcal{S}_T[\mathcal{B}(Q)] \triangleq \{M \mid M \in \mathcal{SN}_T \text{ and } M \longrightarrow_* V \implies V = x : \mathcal{B}(Q)[Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k] \text{ for some } k\}$

Definition 3.17 (Coherent configurations). A quantum configuration (t, u_σ, M) is said to be *coherent* with respect to a typing context Γ with type $A[Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k]$ if the following hold:

- $\cdot \vdash t : Q_1 \otimes \dots \otimes Q_n$ can be derived;
- $\cdot \Vdash u_\sigma : U(Q_1 \otimes \dots \otimes Q_n, Q''_1 \otimes \dots \otimes Q''_{m+k})$ can be derived;
- $\Gamma, x_1 : \mathcal{B}(Q''_1), \dots, x_m : \mathcal{B}(Q''_m) \vdash M : A$ can be derived;
- $[Q''_1, \dots, Q''_{m+k}] = [Q''_1, \dots, Q''_m, Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k]$ as lists of pure quantum types.

Definition 3.18 (Coherent term). A term M is said to be *coherent* with respect to a typing context Γ with type $A[Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k]$ if there exist t, u_σ such that (t, u_σ, M) is a coherent configuration with respect to Γ .

Remark 3.19. Note that when $\Gamma = \emptyset$ a coherent configuration is just a well-typed configuration. Similarly, in this case a coherent term is just a well-typed term.

Definition 3.20 (Substitution function). A substitution function is a map $l : \text{VARS} \rightarrow \text{VALUES}$. For a term M , Ml denotes the term obtained after substituting the free variables in M with their image under l .

For a typing context Γ , we define a set $\mathcal{S}_C[\Gamma] \triangleq \{l \mid \text{dom}(l) = \text{dom}(\Gamma) \text{ and } x : A \in \Gamma \implies lx \in \mathcal{S}_T[A]\}$.

Now we prove a series of results, which lead to Theorem 3.28.

Theorem 3.21 (Progress). *For $M : A[Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k]$, there are two possibilities:*

- *either $M \in \text{VALUES}$,*
- *or there exists $M_1 \in A[Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k]$ such that $M \longrightarrow_{p_1} M_1$.*

Let $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ be the set of all such distinct (i.e., not α -equivalent) terms. Then, the set I is finite, and $\sum_{i \in I} p_i = 1$.

Theorem 3.22 (Subject Reduction). *For any $M : A[Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k]$, if $M \longrightarrow_p M'$, for some probability $p \in [0, 1]$, then $M' : A[Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k]$.*

Lemma 3.23. *For a type A , if $M \in \mathcal{S}_T[A]$ then $M \in \mathcal{SN}_T$.*

Lemma 3.24. *For terms M, M' , if $M \in \mathcal{S}_T[A]$ for some A , and $M \longrightarrow_p M'$ then $M' \in \mathcal{S}_T[A]$.*

Lemma 3.25. *If $M[V/x] \in \mathcal{S}_T[A]$, then $(\lambda x.M)V \in \mathcal{S}_T[A]$.*

Theorem 3.26. *If M is a coherent term with respect to Γ of type $A[Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k]$ then $\forall l \in \mathcal{S}_C[\Gamma], Ml \in \mathcal{S}_T[A]$.*

Proof. Proof is by induction on the formation rule for the term M . We present some important cases here:

- $\lambda x.M$:

We need to show that $\forall l \in \mathcal{S}_C[\Gamma], Ml \in \mathcal{S}_T[A \multimap B]$.

Note that $(\lambda x.M)l = \lambda x.Ml$ upto α -equivalence. Suffices to check that for $N \in \mathcal{S}_T[A]$ $(\lambda x.Ml)N \in \mathcal{S}_T[B]$. Since $N \in \mathcal{S}_T[A]$, all reductions from this term terminate in finitely many steps to a value of the form V . For each such reduction, we can apply the contextual rule for the relation \longrightarrow to obtain that $(\lambda x.Ml)N$ reduces in each case to a term of the

form $(\lambda x.Ml)V$ in finitely many steps. Note that from Lemma 3.25, it suffices to show that $(Ml)[V/x] \in \mathcal{S}_T[B]$. We know by subject reduction that $(Ml)[V/x]$ is a well-typed term. It follows that $l' = l \cup \{x \mapsto V\} \in \mathcal{S}_C[\Gamma, x : A]$. Hence from IH, it follows that $Ml' \in \mathcal{S}_T[B]$. But $Ml' = M(l \cup \{x \mapsto V\}) = Ml[V/x]$. Hence, $Ml[V/x] \in \mathcal{S}_T[B]$.

- **MN:**

We need to show that for any $l \in \mathcal{S}_C[\Gamma]$, $(MN)l \in \mathcal{S}_T[A]$.

By the induction hypothesis, we know that $Ml \in \mathcal{S}_T[B \multimap A]$, and $Nl \in \mathcal{S}_T[B]$. By the definition of $\mathcal{S}_T[B \multimap A]$ it follows that $(Ml)(Nl) \in \mathcal{S}_T[A]$. However, note that $(Ml)(Nl) = (MN)l$. Thus, we have shown that $(MN)l \in \mathcal{S}_T[A]$ as desired.

- **pure(\mathbf{t}'):**

We need to show that for any $l \in \mathcal{S}_C[\Gamma]$, $\text{pure}(\mathbf{t}')l \in \mathcal{S}_T[\mathcal{B}(Q)]$.

This follows in a straightforward manner since $(\text{pure}(\mathbf{t}')l = \text{pure}(\mathbf{t}'))$, and from the reduction rules in Figure 18, it follows that there are \mathbf{v}, u_σ such that $(\mathbf{v}, u_\sigma, \text{pure}(\mathbf{t}'))$ reduces to a value configuration of the form $(\mathbf{v}', u_\sigma, x)$. Hence $M \longrightarrow_1 x$ and we have that $\text{pure}(\mathbf{t}') \in \mathcal{S}_T[\mathcal{B}(Q)]$.

- **meas(M):**

We need to show that for any $l \in \mathcal{S}_C[\Gamma]$, $\text{meas}(M)l \in \mathcal{S}_T[\overline{Q}]$.

Note that $\text{meas}(M)l = \text{meas}(Ml)$. Now, applying the induction hypothesis, we have that $Ml \in \mathcal{S}_T[\mathcal{B}(Q)]$. Hence, there exists a k such that Ml reduces to a term of the form x in atmost k reduction steps. Applying the contextual reduction rule above we get that $\text{meas}(M)$ reduces to a term of the form $\text{meas}(x)$ in atmost k steps. Finally, applying the reduction rule for measurement from Figure 18 gives us a value configuration of the desired form. Hence, we have that $\text{meas}(M)l \in \mathcal{S}_T[\overline{Q}]$.

- **$\mathcal{B}(u)(M)$:**

This case follows by an argument similar to the case for measurement. □

Theorem 3.27. $M : A[Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k] \Longrightarrow M \in \mathcal{SN}_T$.

Proof. We know from Theorem 3.26, that for all $l \in \mathcal{S}_C[\emptyset]$, $Ml \in \mathcal{S}_T[A]$. But if $\Gamma = \emptyset$, $Ml = M$. Hence $M \in \mathcal{S}_T[A]$. From Lemma 3.23 it follows that $M \in \mathcal{SN}_T$. □

Theorem 3.28. $\mathcal{C} \in \text{WF}_{svConf}(A[Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k]) \Longrightarrow \mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{SN}_C$.

Proof. Follows from Lemma 3.16 and Theorem 3.27. □

Theorem 3.29 (Strong Normalisation). *For a configuration $\mathcal{C} \in \text{WF}_{svConf}(A)$, there is no infinite sequence of reductions $\mathcal{C} \rightsquigarrow_{p_0} \mathcal{C}_1 \rightsquigarrow_{p_1} \mathcal{C}_2 \rightsquigarrow_{p_2} \dots$.*

Proof. Follows from Theorem 3.28. □

4. ILLUSTRATING EXAMPLES

Here we give several examples to illustrate the utility of our calculus. We start with some seminal quantum algorithms such as Teleportation expressed in our syntax and how it evolves in our semantics. To further highlight the need to combine quantum and classical control, we illustrate a commonplace quantum algorithm requiring a language which supports both.

Example 4.1. Let $|\phi\rangle \triangleq 1/\sqrt{3} \cdot |000\rangle + 1/\sqrt{3} \cdot |010\rangle + 1/\sqrt{3} \cdot |011\rangle$ and consider the following term:

$$M : \mathcal{B}(\text{qbit}^2) \otimes \text{bit}$$

$$M \triangleq \text{let } \mathcal{B}(x \otimes y) = \text{pure}(|\phi\rangle) \text{ in } x \otimes \text{meas}(y)$$

Since, by Figure 18, the following reduction holds

$$(*, u_{id}, \text{pure}(|\phi\rangle)) \rightarrow_1 (|\phi\rangle, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}}, z),$$

we obtain the following small-step reduction using an application of the contextual rule of Figure 18

$$(*, u_{id}, M) \rightarrow_1 (|\phi\rangle, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}}, \text{let } \mathcal{B}(x \otimes y) = z \text{ in } x \otimes \text{meas}(y)).$$

Consequently, the reductions below hold

$$\begin{aligned} & (|\phi\rangle, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}}, \text{let } \mathcal{B}(x \otimes y) = z \text{ in } x \otimes \text{meas}(y)) \\ & \rightsquigarrow_1 (\sqrt{2}/\sqrt{3} \cdot (1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |000\rangle + 1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |010\rangle) + 1/\sqrt{3} \cdot |011\rangle, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}}, x \otimes \text{meas}(y)) \\ & \quad \begin{cases} \rightsquigarrow_{2/3} (1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |00\rangle + 1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |01\rangle, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}}, x \otimes \text{inl}(*)) \\ \rightsquigarrow_{1/3} (|01\rangle, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}}, x \otimes \text{inr}(*)) \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where x points to the first two qubits, and y points to the last qubit. Note that the unitary $u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}}$ acts on the state $* \otimes |\phi\rangle$, and $|\phi\rangle$ is syntactic sugar representing it, as clarified in the beginning of this section.

Example 4.2 (Bell State). We show how a *Bell state* $\text{Bell} \triangleq 1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |00\rangle + 1/\sqrt{2} \cdot |11\rangle$ can be prepared by a term of our calculus. We do this by preparing two qubits and applying the necessary unitary operations on them:

$$\text{Bell}_S : \mathcal{B}(\text{qbit}^2)$$

$$\text{Bell}_S \triangleq \text{let } \mathcal{B}(z) = \mathcal{B}(H)(\text{pure}(|0\rangle)) \otimes \text{pure}(|0\rangle) \text{ in } \mathcal{B}(CNOT)(z)$$

By the rules given in Figure 18, we have the following:

$$(*, u_{id}, \mathcal{B}(H)(\text{pure}(|0\rangle)) \otimes \text{pure}(|0\rangle)) \rightarrow_1 (\text{Bell}, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}}, x \otimes y)$$

Hence, $(*, u_{id}, \text{Bell}_S) \rightarrow_1 (\text{Bell}, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}}, \text{let } \mathcal{B}(z) = x \otimes y \text{ in } \mathcal{B}(CNOT)(z))$

Thus, applying rules from Figure 18 and Definition 3.6 we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{Bell}, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}}, \text{let } \mathcal{B}(z) = x \otimes y \text{ in } \mathcal{B}(CNOT)(z)) \rightarrow_1 (\text{Bell}, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}}, \mathcal{B}(CNOT)(z)) \\ & (\text{Bell}, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}}, \mathcal{B}(CNOT)(z)) \rightsquigarrow_1 (\text{Bell}, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}}, z) \end{aligned}$$

Example 4.3 (Bell Measurement). We illustrate the measurement of two qubits with respect to the *Bell basis*. For that purpose, we first apply a unitary operation on the qubits and finally measure them with respect to the computational basis:

$$\text{Bell}_M : \text{qbit} \multimap (\text{qbit} \multimap \text{bit} \otimes \text{bit})$$

$$\text{Bell}_M \triangleq \lambda x. \lambda y. \text{let } \mathcal{B}(z) = x \otimes y \text{ in let } q_1 \otimes q_2 = \mathcal{B}(CNOT)(z) \text{ in meas}(\mathcal{B}(H)(q_1)) \otimes \text{meas}(q_2)$$

Example 4.4 (Teleportation). Teleportation is an algorithm designed to transport a qubit in an unknown state $|\psi\rangle$ using two classical bits ([NC10]) of communication. We now showcase the teleportation algorithm in our calculus. In order to do so, we first construct a term which allows us to apply different unitaries to a qubit based on the values that two bits take:

$$\text{App}_U : \text{qbit} \multimap (\text{bit} \otimes \text{bit} \multimap \text{qbit})$$


$$\begin{aligned} \text{App}_U &\triangleq \lambda q. \lambda p. \text{let } x \otimes y = p \text{ in case } x, y \text{ of } \{0, 0 \rightarrow U_{00}(q), \\ &\quad 0, 1 \rightarrow U_{01}(q), \\ &\quad 1, 0 \rightarrow U_{10}(q), \\ &\quad 1, 1 \rightarrow U_{11}(q)\} \end{aligned}$$

where $0 \triangleq \text{inl}(\ast)$, $1 \triangleq \text{inr}(\ast)$, and $\text{case } x_1, x_2 \text{ of } \{\dots\}$ denotes 2 nested cases, and U_{ij} denotes the unitary to be applied corresponding to the case when the first bit has value i and the second bit has value j . Finally, terms App_U , Bell_M , and Bell_S can be used to construct quantum teleportation:

$$\text{tele} : \text{qbit} \multimap \text{qbit}$$

$$\text{tele} \triangleq \lambda q. \text{let } \mathcal{B}(x \otimes y) = \text{Bell}_S \text{ in let } b_1 \otimes b_2 = \text{Bell}_M \ x \ q \text{ in } \text{App}_U \ q \ (b_1 \otimes b_2)$$

Example 4.5 (*Quantum walk search*). Given a graph with some marked vertices, a quantum walk search is the quantum analogue of a random walk [CCD⁺03], which looks for these marked vertices. Each node in the graph represents the state of two quantum registers. A conditional on the application of a coin operator on the first register decides the direction in which a walker should take the next step. A step in this direction is represented by the application of a unitary on the second register. After a given number of steps, measurement is performed on the second register to reveal whether the walker has arrived on a marked node. Here, we present a k -step quantum walk on a cycle with 10 nodes for simplicity in our language. Representing the second register with qubits, in this case, would require 4 qubits, whereas we represent the state of the second register with a single **qnat**. In the unitary $\text{CNOT}_{\text{qnat}}$ below, we use some (hopefully obvious) syntactic sugar with the expressions involving **n** in order to avoid writing all the cases; the letter **n** there should not be seen as a variable.



We define the unitary S corresponding to one step of the walk as $S \triangleq \text{CNOT}_{\text{qnat}} \circ (\text{Had} \otimes \text{Id})$. Finally, the k -step walk can be represented in our language as follows, where S^k represents k compositions of S with itself:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{walk} &: (\mathcal{B}(\text{qbit} \otimes \text{qnat}) \multimap \text{qbit} \otimes \text{Nat}) \\ \text{walk} &\triangleq \lambda z. \text{let } \mathcal{B}(x_1 \otimes x_2) = \mathcal{B}(S^k)(z) \text{ in } x_1 \otimes \text{meas}(x_2) \end{aligned}$$

We now exhibit how the lambda expression for the quantum walk would reduce in our semantics when evaluated at the quantum state $|0\rangle \otimes |\underline{0}\rangle$ for $k = 1$. For the rest of this example, let $M \triangleq \text{let } \mathcal{B}(x_1 \otimes x_2) = \mathcal{B}(W)(z) \text{ in } x_1 \otimes \text{meas}(x_2)$ and $\mathbf{v} \triangleq |0\rangle \otimes |\underline{0}\rangle$. The following reductions can be derived:

$$\begin{aligned} (\ast, u_{id}, \text{pure}(\mathbf{v})) &\rightsquigarrow_1 (\ast \otimes \mathbf{v}, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}} \circ (u_{id} \otimes u_{id})}, x) \\ (\ast, u_{id}, (\lambda z. M) \text{pure}(\mathbf{v})) &\rightsquigarrow_1 (\ast \otimes \mathbf{v}, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}} \circ (u_{id} \otimes u_{id}), M[x/z]) \end{aligned}$$

It also holds that,

$$\begin{aligned} & (* \otimes \mathbf{v}, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}} \circ (u_{\text{id}} \otimes u_{\text{id}}), \text{let } \mathcal{B}(x_1 \otimes x_2) = \mathcal{B}(S)(x) \text{ in } x_1 \otimes \text{meas}(x_2)) \\ & \rightsquigarrow_1 (S(* \otimes \mathbf{v}), u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}} \circ (u_{\text{id}} \otimes u_{\text{id}}), \text{let } \mathcal{B}(x_1 \otimes x_2) = x \text{ in } x_1 \otimes \text{meas}(x_2)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\frac{\frac{(*, u_{\text{id}}, \text{pure}(\mathbf{v})) \rightsquigarrow_1 (* \otimes \mathbf{v}, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}} \circ (u_{\text{id}} \otimes u_{\text{id}}), x)}{(*, u_{\text{id}}, (\lambda z.M)\text{pure}(\mathbf{v})) \rightsquigarrow_1 (* \otimes \mathbf{v}, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}} \circ (u_{\text{id}} \otimes u_{\text{id}}), M[x/z])}}{(* \otimes \mathbf{v}, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}} \circ (u_{\text{id}} \otimes u_{\text{id}}), \text{let } \mathcal{B}(x_1 \otimes x_2) = \mathcal{B}(S)(x) \text{ in } x_1 \otimes \text{meas}(x_2)) \rightsquigarrow_1 (u(* \otimes \mathbf{v}), u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}} \circ (u_{\text{id}} \otimes u_{\text{id}}), \text{let } \mathcal{B}(x_1 \otimes x_2) = x \text{ in } x_1 \otimes \text{meas}(x_2))}$$

The unitary u in the above derivation is given by $u \triangleq (u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}} \circ (u_{\text{id}} \otimes u_{\text{id}}))^* \circ (S \otimes \text{id}) \circ (u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}} \circ (u_{\text{id}} \otimes u_{\text{id}}))$. The quantum term $u(* \otimes \mathbf{v})$ rewrites to $\mathbf{v}' \triangleq 1/\sqrt{2} \cdot (* \otimes |\mathbf{0}\rangle \otimes |\mathbf{1}\rangle + * \otimes |\mathbf{1}\rangle \otimes |\mathbf{0}\rangle)$. We define $\text{nine} \triangleq \text{succ}^9(\text{zero})$. Thus, the following reductions hold

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{v}', u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}} \circ (u_{\text{id}} \otimes u_{\text{id}}), \text{let } \mathcal{B}(x_1 \otimes x_2) = x \text{ in } x_1 \otimes \text{meas}(x_2)) \\ & \rightsquigarrow_1 (\mathbf{v}', u_{\sigma_{\text{divide}}} \circ (u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}} \circ (u_{\text{id}} \otimes u_{\text{id}})), x_1 \otimes \text{meas}(x_2)) \\ & \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \rightsquigarrow_{1/2} (* \otimes |\mathbf{0}\rangle, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}}, x_1 \otimes \text{succ}(\text{zero})) \\ \rightsquigarrow_{1/2} (* \otimes |\mathbf{1}\rangle, u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}}, x_1 \otimes \text{nine}) \end{array} \right. \end{aligned}$$

5. HEISENBERG VS SCHRÖDINGER PICTURES OF QUANTUM MECHANICS

Before going on to lay down the denotational model, in this section we describe the physical theory closely tied into it.

The set $\mathcal{B}(H) \triangleq \{x: H \rightarrow H \mid x \text{ is a bounded operator}\}$ has the structure of a vector space when equipped with the obvious operations of addition and scalar multiplication of operators. Operators in $\mathcal{B}(H)$ are closed under composition, which we also call multiplication, and moreover, this operation gives the vector space $\mathcal{B}(H)$ the additional structure of an *algebra*. The operation of taking adjoints $(-)^*$ is an *involution* on $\mathcal{B}(H)$ and this gives the algebra $\mathcal{B}(H)$ the structure of a **-algebra*. The space $\mathcal{B}(H)$ is, in fact, a von Neumann algebra (we define this later) and also a Banach space with respect to the well-known operator norm.

Another important space (which is not a von Neumann algebra in general) is the space $\mathcal{T}(H)$ of *trace class* operators on the Hilbert space H . Intuitively, this is a space of operators that admit an appropriate notion of trace (e.g., if H is finite-dimensional, then all linear operators on it are trace class). Then a quantum operation (also called quantum channel) from H_1 to H_2 in the *Schrödinger picture* is a *completely-positive trace-preserving* (CPTP) map $\varphi: \mathcal{T}(H_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(H_2)$. Whereas the corresponding quantum operation (channel) in the *Heisenberg picture* is a *normal completely-positive unital* (NCPU) map $\varphi^*: \mathcal{B}(H_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(H_1)$ that goes in the other direction and which is determined by the Banach space adjoint of φ . The Heisenberg-Schrödinger duality can be given a mathematical formulation through the fact that there exists a bijective correspondence between CPTP maps $\mathcal{T}(H_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(H_2)$ and NCPU maps $\mathcal{B}(H_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(H_1)$.

The view of quantum operations presented above does not make it clear how we can explicitly represent *classical* information that we need for our development. One of the strengths of von Neumann algebras is the fact that they allow us to easily and elegantly model not only quantum information, but also classical information. A von Neumann algebra M is

a certain kind of subalgebra $M \subseteq \mathcal{B}(H)$ and classical information may be represented using von Neumann algebras M that are *commutative*, i.e., algebras for which the multiplication operation commutes.

6. DENOTATIONAL SEMANTICS: SOUNDNESS AND ADEQUACY

In this section we describe the denotational semantics of the main calculus. In order to do so, we first introduce some mathematical preliminaries and the relevant categorical structure. The denotational model is based on von Neumann algebras, mathematical structures well-suited to describe not only mixed quantum computation, but also classical information in the Heisenberg picture of quantum mechanics.

Von Neumann algebras. Intuitively, a von Neumann algebra may be understood as a certain kind of (sub)algebra of the space $\mathcal{B}(H)$ of bounded operators on the Hilbert space H . More specifically, a non-empty subset $M \subseteq \mathcal{B}(H)$ is called a **-subalgebra* of $\mathcal{B}(H)$ if M is closed under the operations of addition, scalar multiplication, composition, and involution of $\mathcal{B}(H)$. Given a subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{B}(H)$, its *commutant*, written S' , is the set $S' \triangleq \{x \in \mathcal{B}(H) \mid \forall y \in S, xy = yx\}$, i.e., the operators x that commute (with respect to composition) with all operators in S . A simple algebraic argument shows that $S \subseteq S'' \triangleq (S')'$ for any $S \subseteq \mathcal{B}(H)$. We now give the main definition of this subsection.

Definition 6.1 ([Tak12]). A *von Neumann algebra* on a Hilbert space H is a *-subalgebra M of $\mathcal{B}(H)$ such that $M'' = M$.

Example 6.2. One of the most important examples of a von Neumann algebra is $\mathcal{B}(H)$ itself. Observe that in the special case when H has dimension $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\mathcal{B}(H)$ may be identified with the algebra $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ of complex $n \times n$ matrices.

A von Neumann algebra is *commutative* if for every $x, y \in M$, we have that $xy = yx$. Such von Neumann algebras can be used to represent classical information. The Banach space $\ell^\infty(X) \triangleq \{f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \mid \sup_{x \in X} |f(x)| < \infty\}$, for any set X , equipped with the supremum norm, can be identified with a commutative von Neumann algebra on the Hilbert space $\ell^2(X)$ via the isometric embedding given by $m_X: \ell^\infty(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\ell^2(X))$ and $m_X(f) = m_f$, where $m_f: \ell^2(X) \rightarrow \ell^2(X)$ is the bounded linear operator defined by $m_f(\sum_{x \in X} \alpha_x |x\rangle) \triangleq \sum_{x \in X} f(x) \alpha_x |x\rangle$.

An important special case for our development includes the von Neumann algebra $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{B})$, where $\mathbb{B} = \{true, false\}$, which can be identified with $\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$ and which corresponds to the interpretation for the type of (classical) bits in our language. Another important example is given by the space $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{N})$ which we use to interpret the type Nat of classical natural numbers in our language.

It follows easily from Definition 6.1 that every von Neumann algebra $M \subseteq \mathcal{B}(H)$ contains the identity operator 1_H of H , which we often write as 1_M as well. Obviously, $1_M \in M$ is the neutral element of M with respect to multiplication, called the *unit* of M . Similarly, M always contains the zero operator 0_H which we also write as 0_M . Another important kind of operators are the *self-adjoint* (or Hermitian) operators, which are operators $x \in M$, such that $x = x^*$. An operator $x \in M$ is *positive* if $\langle h, xh \rangle \geq 0$ for every $h \in H$. The poset (partially ordered set) of Hermitian elements of M is given by the set $M_h \triangleq \{x \in M \mid x = x^*\}$ together with the *Löwner order*: $x \leq y$ iff $y - x$ is a positive operator. It follows that $x \in M$ is positive iff $0_M \leq x$. Another important poset is the *unit interval* of M : the subposet of M_h

given by $[0, 1]_M \triangleq \{x \in M_h \mid 0_M \leq x \leq 1_M\}$. In fact, $[0, 1]_M$ is a dcpo (*directed-complete partial order*) with least element 0_M .

Categorical Structure. Next, we recall two important types of morphisms between von Neumann algebras. We use them to organise the relevant data into categories that allow us to define our semantic interpretation.

NMIU maps. Let M and N be two von Neumann algebras (not necessarily over the same Hilbert space). A linear function $\varphi: M \rightarrow N$ is called *multiplicative/involution/unital* if it preserves multiplication/involution/the unit of M , respectively. A linear map $\varphi: M \rightarrow N$ is called *subunital* if $\varphi(1_M) \leq 1_N$. When a map $\varphi: M \rightarrow N$ is both positive and subunital, then it restricts to a map $[0, 1]_M \rightarrow [0, 1]_N$ and we say that φ is *normal* whenever this restriction is a Scott-continuous map between the two dcpos. A map $\varphi: M \rightarrow N$ is called an *NMIU*-map, if it is normal, multiplicative, involutive, and unital.

NCPSU maps. If N is a von Neumann algebra (over H), then we can equip the set $M_n(N)$ of $n \times n$ matrices with entries in N with the structure of a von Neumann algebra (over $\oplus_{i=1}^n H$). If $\varphi: N \rightarrow N'$ is a linear map between von Neumann algebras, then we can define a linear map $\varphi^{(n)}: M_n(N) \rightarrow M_n(N')$, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by using φ component-wise. The map $\varphi: N \rightarrow N'$ is *completely positive* if $\varphi^{(n)}: M_n(N) \rightarrow M_n(N')$ is positive for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A map $\varphi: M \rightarrow N$ is called an *NCP(S)U*-map, if it is normal, completely positive, and (sub)unital.

The two main notions of morphisms that we use in our semantics are given by the NMIU and NCPSU maps. Every NMIU-map is also NCP(S)U, but not vice-versa (e.g., state preparation), hence NMIU-maps give a stronger notion of morphism. We write $\mathbf{NMIU} \subseteq \mathbf{NCPSU}$ for the *opposite* (sub)categories with objects von Neumann algebras and with NMIU/ NCPSU maps as morphisms between them. There are several reasons for working with the opposite categories:

- They allow us to reason appropriately about certain physical processes in the Heisenberg picture (as it is customary with von Neumann algebras), rather than in the Schrödinger one;
- The aforementioned opposite categories enjoy several categorical properties that we use in our semantics that are not known to hold for their non-opposite counterparts (e.g., monoidal closure, coproducts).

Symmetric Monoidal Structure. The categories \mathbf{NMIU} and \mathbf{NCPSU} have a symmetric monoidal structure when equipped with the *spatial tensor product* [Kor17, Prop 7.2]: the tensor unit can be identified with \mathbb{C} , and the tensor product of von Neumann algebras $M \subseteq B(H)$ and $N \subseteq B(K)$, written $M \otimes N$, is the smallest von Neumann subalgebra of $B(H \otimes K)$ that contains the algebraic tensor product $M \odot N$ of the underlying vector spaces. The subcategory inclusion $\mathcal{I}: \mathbf{NMIU} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{NCPSU}$ is a *strict* symmetric monoidal functor. Moreover, the category \mathbf{NMIU} is a *closed* symmetric monoidal category and we write N^{*M} for its internal hom [Kor17].

For simplicity, here we identify $M_n(B(H))$ and $B(\oplus_{i=1}^n H)$.

Coproducts. Both categories **NMIU** and **NCPSU** have coproducts that are described in the same way: the initial object is the von Neumann algebra on the zero-dimensional Hilbert space 0 and the coproduct is given by direct sum with respect to the supremum norm [Tak12, Definition 3.4]. More specifically, if $M \subseteq \mathcal{B}(H)$ and $N \subseteq \mathcal{B}(K)$ are von Neumann algebras, then $M \oplus N$ is a Banach space (equipped with the supremum norm) which can be isometrically embedded into $\mathcal{B}(H \oplus K)$. The image of $M \oplus N$ under this embedding is a von Neumann subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(H \oplus K)$, but we abuse notation and we do not carefully distinguish between the two as the differences are not essential.

Before delving into the details of the interpretation, we present the functor which facilitates the main contribution of the paper, i.e combining quantum and classical control.

The \mathcal{B} functor. In order to model the interaction between the pure quantum subsystem and the main calculus, we define $\mathcal{B} : \mathbf{Isometry} \rightarrow \mathbf{NCPSU}$




FIGURE 19. Categorical relations.

and show it is a functor (Lemma 6.3) mapping a Hilbert space H to $\mathcal{B}(H)$. For an isometry $f: H_1 \rightarrow H_2$, the map $(f^* \circ (-) \circ f)$ is an NCPSU morphism $B(H_2) \rightarrow B(H_1)$, so by defining $\mathcal{B}(f) \triangleq (f^* \circ (-) \circ f)^{op}$, we get that $\mathcal{B}(f): \mathcal{B}(H_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(H_2)$ in **NCPSU**. We remark that this functor restricts to a functor $\mathcal{B}: \mathbf{Unitary} \rightarrow \mathbf{NMIU}$ and we show that the functor $\mathcal{B}: \mathbf{Isometry} \rightarrow \mathbf{NCPSU}$ is strict monoidal.

Lemma 6.3. *The map $\mathcal{B}: \mathbf{Isometry} \rightarrow \mathbf{NCPSU}$ as defined above is a functor.*

Proof. We first need to show that if f is an isometry then the function $\phi \mapsto f^* \circ \phi \circ f$ is a ncpsu map from $B(H_2)$ to $B(H_1)$. Note that for $\phi = Id_{B(H_2)}$ we have,

$$f^* \circ (Id) \circ f = f^* \circ f = Id_{B(H_1)}$$

Hence the map is unital. To show that it is completely positive, recall that every von Neumann algebra is a C^* -algebra, and hence it suffices to check an equivalent condition for complete positivity of maps defined on C^* -algebra. Hence we need to show that for any $\{\phi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in B(H_2)$ and $\{\psi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \in B(H_1)$, $\sum_{i,j} \psi_i^* (f^* \circ (\phi_i^* \phi_j) \circ f) \psi_j$ is positive. However we have,

$$\sum_{i,j} \psi_i^* (f^* \circ (\phi_i^* \phi_j) \circ f) \psi_j = (\sum_i \phi_i \circ f \circ \psi_i)^* (\sum_i \phi_i \circ f \circ \psi_i)$$

Hence, the above summation is positive.

To show that $\psi \triangleq f^* \circ (-) \circ f: B(H_2) \rightarrow B(H_1)$ is normal, it suffices to show that ψ has a predual $\tau: T(H_1) \rightarrow T(H_2)$. But the predual is obviously $\tau = f \circ (-) \circ f^*$. Indeed, one can easily see that τ is positive and therefore bounded with respect to the trace norm (it is also trace preserving). To check that τ is indeed the predual, we simply have to verify that for any $t \in T(H_1)$ and $b \in B(H_2)$ we have that

$$\text{tr}(\psi(b)t) = \text{tr}(b\tau(t)).$$

Indeed we have

$$\text{tr}(\psi(b)t) = \text{tr}(f^* b f t) = \text{tr}(b f t f^*) = \text{tr}(b \tau(t))$$

as required, so that ψ is indeed normal.

Recall that **NCPSU** is the *opposite* category of the category of von Neumann algebras with NCPSU maps.

Every other property of a functor is trivially true. \square

Definition 6.4 ([HV19]). Let $(C, \otimes_C, 1_C)$ and $(D, \otimes_D, 1_D)$ be monoidal categories. A **lax monoidal functor** $\mathcal{F} : (C, \otimes_C, 1_C) \rightarrow (D, \otimes_D, 1_D)$ is

- a functor $\mathcal{F} : C \rightarrow D$,
- a morphism $e : 1_D \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(1_C)$,
- a natural transformation $\mu_{x,y} : \mathcal{F}(x) \otimes_D \mathcal{F}(y) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(x \otimes_C y)$,

such that:

- (**associativity**) for all $x, y, z \in \mathbf{Ob}(C)$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 (\mathcal{F}(x) \otimes_D \mathcal{F}(y)) \otimes_D \mathcal{F}(z) & \xrightarrow{a_D} & \mathcal{F}(x) \otimes_D (\mathcal{F}(y) \otimes_D \mathcal{F}(z)) \\
 \downarrow \mu \otimes id & & \downarrow id \otimes \mu \\
 \mathcal{F}(x \otimes_C y) \otimes_D \mathcal{F}(z) & & \mathcal{F}(x) \otimes_D \mathcal{F}(y \otimes_C z) \\
 \downarrow \mu & & \downarrow \mu \\
 \mathcal{F}((x \otimes_C y) \otimes_C z) & \xrightarrow{\overline{\mathcal{F}(a_C)}} & \mathcal{F}(x \otimes_C (y \otimes_C z))
 \end{array}$$

commutes,

- (**unitality**) for all $x \in \mathbf{Ob}(C)$, the diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 1_D \otimes_D \mathcal{F}(x) & \xrightarrow{e \otimes id} & \mathcal{F}(1_C) \otimes_D \mathcal{F}(x) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \mu \\
 \mathcal{F}(x) & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{F}(1_C \otimes_C x)
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{F}(x) \otimes_D 1_D & \xrightarrow{id \otimes e} & \mathcal{F}(x) \otimes_D \mathcal{F}(1_C) \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \mu \\
 \mathcal{F}(x) & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \mathcal{F}(x \otimes_C 1_C)
 \end{array}$$

commute.

Definition 6.5. A **strict monoidal functor** is a lax monoidal functor (Definition 6.4) $(\mathcal{F}, e, \mu_{x,y})$ such that e and $\mu_{x,y}$ are identity maps.

The functor $\mathcal{B} : \mathbf{Isometry} \rightarrow \mathbf{NCPSU}$ is strict monoidal.

Proof. From eqn(10) on page 185 in [Tak12], it follows that $\mathcal{B}(H_1) \otimes \mathcal{B}(H_2) \cong_{\mu_{H_1, H_2}} \mathcal{B}(H_1 \otimes H_2)$. Here μ_{H_1, H_2} is just the identity. Then for Hilbert spaces H_1, H_2, K_1, K_2 and isometries f, g we need to show the following:

$$\mathcal{B}(f) \otimes \mathcal{B}(g) = \mathcal{B}(f \otimes g)$$

First we show this for the generators of the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{B}(H_1) \otimes \mathcal{B}(H_2)$ which are of the form $\phi_1 \otimes \phi_2$. Note that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(f) \otimes \mathcal{B}(g)(\phi_1 \otimes \phi_2) &= (f^* \circ \phi_1 \circ f) \otimes (g^* \circ \phi_2 \circ g) \\ &= (f^* \otimes g^*) \circ (\phi_1 \otimes \phi_2) \circ (f \otimes g) \\ &= (f \otimes g)^* \circ (\phi_1 \otimes \phi_2) \circ (f \otimes g) \\ &= \mathcal{B}(f \otimes g)(\phi_1 \otimes \phi_2) \end{aligned}$$

This argument extends to linear combinations of elements of the form $\phi_1 \otimes \phi_2 \in \mathcal{B}(H_1) \otimes \mathcal{B}(H_2)$. Recalling the definition of the spatial tensor product, note that $(\mathcal{B}(H_1) \otimes \mathcal{B}(H_2))''$ is the closure of $\mathcal{B}(H_1) \otimes \mathcal{B}(H_2)$ in the ultraweak topology. Hence we have that the other elements of this von Neumann algebra are limits of such linear combinations in the ultraweak topology. Let X be a directed set and $\phi = \lim_{x \in X} \phi_x$ the limit of a directed net $\{\phi_x\}_{x \in X}$, where the above equation holds for ϕ_x for all x . Then we have the following:

$$\mathcal{B}(f) \otimes \mathcal{B}(g)(\phi) = \mathcal{B}(f) \otimes \mathcal{B}(g)(\lim_{x \in X} \phi_x) \quad (6.1)$$

$$= \lim_{x \in X} \mathcal{B}(f) \otimes \mathcal{B}(g)(\phi_x) \quad (6.2)$$

$$= \lim_{x \in X} \mathcal{B}(f \otimes g)(\phi_x) \quad (6.3)$$

$$= \mathcal{B}(f \otimes g)(\lim_{x \in X} \phi_x) \quad (6.4)$$

$$= \mathcal{B}(f \otimes g)(\phi) \quad (6.5)$$

In the above calculation, (2) holds, because normal maps are continuous with respect to the ultraweak topology, and the tensor product of normal maps is a normal map. Similarly, (4) holds because composition of normal maps is a normal map. \square

Interpretation of Types. We interpret types as von Neumann algebras. The types corresponding to a linear call-by-value lambda-calculus are interpreted in the standard way: $\llbracket \mathbf{I} \rrbracket \triangleq \mathbb{C}$, $\llbracket A + B \rrbracket \triangleq \llbracket A \rrbracket \oplus \llbracket B \rrbracket$, $\llbracket A \otimes B \rrbracket \triangleq \llbracket A \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket B \rrbracket$, $\llbracket !A \rrbracket \triangleq \llbracket A \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket A \multimap B \rrbracket \triangleq \llbracket A \rrbracket \multimap \llbracket B \rrbracket$. The type for natural numbers is interpreted as the commutative von Neumann algebra $\ell^\infty(\mathbb{N})$, i.e $\llbracket \text{Nat} \rrbracket \triangleq \ell^\infty(\mathbb{N})$. Finally, the interpretation of the type $\mathcal{B}(Q)$ uses the \mathcal{B} functor that allows us to incorporate pure quantum primitives into our semantics, i.e $\llbracket \mathcal{B}(Q) \rrbracket \triangleq \mathcal{B}[\llbracket Q \rrbracket]$.

Interpretation of Typing judgements. A typing judgment of the form $\Delta \vdash M : A$ is interpreted as a morphism $\llbracket \Delta \vdash M : A \rrbracket : \llbracket \Delta \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket A \rrbracket$ in **NCPSU** and we often abbreviate this by writing $\llbracket M \rrbracket$. The full interpretation of typing judgements are given in Figure 20. We now describe some of the notation used therein.

We use the symbol \diamond for the canonical discarding map that may be defined at types $!A$ and non-linear contexts $!\Delta$. For a non-linear context $!\Delta$ we may define a copy (or diagonal) map $d_{! \Delta} : \llbracket !\Delta \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket !\Delta \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket !\Delta \rrbracket$ in the standard way and also the map $split \triangleq \left(\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \rrbracket \xrightarrow{d \otimes id \otimes id} \llbracket !\Delta, !\Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\cong} \llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1 \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_2 \rrbracket \right)$.

Given a non-linear context $!\Delta \triangleq \{x_1 : !A_1, \dots, x_n : !A_n\}$, the *promotion* map is defined as usual by $\rho_{! \Delta} \triangleq \llbracket !\Delta \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}[\llbracket A_1 \rrbracket] \times \dots \times \mathcal{R}[\llbracket A_n \rrbracket]) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}\eta} !\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}[\llbracket A_1 \rrbracket] \times \dots \times \mathcal{R}[\llbracket A_n \rrbracket]) \xrightarrow{\cong} \llbracket !\Delta \rrbracket$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \Gamma, y : B, x : A, \Sigma \vdash M : C \rrbracket &\triangleq \llbracket \Gamma, x : A, y : B, \Sigma \vdash M : C \rrbracket \circ (id_{\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket} \otimes \gamma \otimes id_{\llbracket \Sigma \rrbracket}) \\
\llbracket !\Delta \vdash * : I \rrbracket &\triangleq \llbracket !\Delta \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\circ !\Delta} \llbracket I \rrbracket \\
\llbracket !\Delta, x : A \vdash x : A \rrbracket &\triangleq \llbracket !\Delta \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket A \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\circ !\Delta \otimes id} \llbracket I \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket A \rrbracket \cong \llbracket A \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \Delta \vdash inl(N) : A + B \rrbracket &\triangleq i_1 \circ \llbracket \Delta \vdash N : A \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \Delta \vdash inr(M) : A + B \rrbracket &\triangleq i_2 \circ \llbracket \Delta \vdash M : B \rrbracket \\
\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash case L of \{ inl(x) \rightarrow M, inr(y) \rightarrow N \} : C \rrbracket \\
&\triangleq [\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_2, x : A \vdash M : C \rrbracket, \llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_2, y : B \vdash N : C \rrbracket] \circ \cong \circ (\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash L : A + B \rrbracket \otimes id) \circ split \\
\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash M \otimes N : A \otimes B \rrbracket &\triangleq (\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash M : A \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_2 \vdash N : B \rrbracket) \circ split \\
\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash let x \otimes y = M in N : C \rrbracket \\
&\triangleq \llbracket !\Delta, x : A, y : B, \Sigma_2 \vdash N : C \rrbracket \circ (\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash M : A \otimes B \rrbracket \otimes id) \circ split \\
\llbracket !\Delta \vdash lift(M) : !A \rrbracket &\triangleq !\llbracket !\Delta \vdash M : A \rrbracket \circ \rho_{!A} \\
\llbracket \Delta \vdash force(M) : A \rrbracket &\triangleq \mu \circ \llbracket \Delta \vdash M : !A \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \Delta \vdash \lambda x. M : A \multimap B \rrbracket &\triangleq \Phi_2 \circ \Phi_1(\llbracket \Delta, x : A \vdash M : B \rrbracket) \\
\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash M N : B \rrbracket &\triangleq \epsilon_{B,A} \circ (\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash M : A \multimap B \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_2 \vdash N : A \rrbracket) \circ split \\
\llbracket !\Delta \vdash zero : Nat \rrbracket &\triangleq \llbracket !\Delta \rrbracket \xrightarrow{\circ !\Delta} \llbracket I \rrbracket \xrightarrow{i_0} \llbracket Nat \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \Delta \vdash succ(M) \rrbracket &\triangleq s \circ \llbracket \Delta \vdash M : Nat \rrbracket \\
\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash match L with \{ zero \rightarrow M, succ(x) \rightarrow N \} : A \rrbracket \\
&\triangleq [\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_2 \vdash M : A \rrbracket, \llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_2, x : Nat \vdash N : A \rrbracket] \circ \cong \circ (id \otimes \llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash L : Nat \rrbracket) \circ split \\
\llbracket !\Delta \vdash pure(t) : \mathcal{B}(Q) \rrbracket &\triangleq \mathcal{B}[t] \circ \diamond_{!A} \\
\llbracket \Delta \vdash meas(M) : \overline{Q} \rrbracket &\triangleq m^Q \circ \llbracket \Delta \vdash M : \mathcal{B}(Q) \rrbracket \\
\llbracket \Delta \vdash \mathcal{B}(u)(M) : \mathcal{B}(Q_2) \rrbracket &\triangleq \mathcal{B}[u] \circ \llbracket \Delta \vdash M : \mathcal{B}(Q_1) \rrbracket \\
\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash let \mathcal{B}(z) = M in N : A \rrbracket \\
&\triangleq \llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_2, z : \mathcal{B}(Q_1 \otimes Q_2) \vdash N : A \rrbracket \circ (\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash M : \mathcal{B}(Q_1) \otimes \mathcal{B}(Q_2) \rrbracket \otimes id) \circ split \\
\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash let \mathcal{B}(x \otimes y) = M in N : A \rrbracket \\
&\triangleq \llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_2, x : \mathcal{B}(Q_1), y : \mathcal{B}(Q_2) \vdash N : A \rrbracket \circ (\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash M : \mathcal{B}(Q_1 \otimes Q_2) \rrbracket \otimes id) \circ split
\end{aligned}$$

FIGURE 20. Interpretation of typing judgements.

We write $\gamma_{A,B} : A \otimes B \rightarrow B \otimes A$ for the monoidal symmetry. The successor map is given by $s : \llbracket Nat \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket Nat \rrbracket :: (x_1, x_2, \dots) \mapsto (0, x_1, x_2, \dots)$.

In order to interpret measurement, we need the following theorem:

Theorem 6.6. *For every pure quantum type Q , there exist a set X , an NMIU isomorphism $\alpha_{\overline{Q}} : \llbracket \overline{Q} \rrbracket \cong \ell^\infty(X)$, and an isometric isomorphism $\beta_Q : \llbracket Q \rrbracket \cong \ell^2(X)$. Moreover, $\forall \mathbf{b} \in \text{Basis Values}$, $\exists x \in X$ s.t. $\beta_Q(\llbracket \mathbf{b} \rrbracket) = \alpha_{\overline{Q}}(\llbracket \overline{\mathbf{b}} \rrbracket) = |x\rangle$.*

Proof. (Sketch) Proof is by induction on the form of Q .

- $Q = I$:

$$\llbracket I \rrbracket = \mathbb{C} \cong \ell^2(\{*\}) \quad \llbracket \overline{I} \rrbracket = \mathbb{C} \cong \ell^\infty(\{*\})$$

Moreover, in this case we have $\mathbf{b} = *$, and $\overline{\mathbf{b}} = *$. We also know that $\llbracket * \rrbracket = \llbracket \overline{*} \rrbracket = 1 \in \mathbb{C}$. However, the scalar 1 can be identified with $|*\rangle$. Hence the second statement of the theorem also holds.

- $Q = \text{qnat}$:

$$\llbracket \text{qnat} \rrbracket = \ell^2(\mathbb{N}) \quad \llbracket \overline{\text{qnat}} \rrbracket = \llbracket \text{Nat} \rrbracket = \ell^\infty(\mathbb{N})$$

In this case the isomorphisms are identity maps, and we know that $\{\mathbf{b}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} = \{|n\rangle\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ because of Definition 2.4. Similarly, $\{\overline{\mathbf{b}}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} = \{|n\rangle\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Hence, the second statement of the theorem also holds.

- $Q = Q_1 \otimes Q_2$:

By induction hypothesis we have that $\alpha_{\overline{Q_1}} : \llbracket \overline{Q_1} \rrbracket \rightarrow \ell^\infty(X_1)$ and $\beta_{Q_1} : \llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket \rightarrow \ell^2(X_1)$ for some set X_1 . Furthermore, for all i , we have the relation $\beta_{Q_1}(\llbracket \mathbf{b}_i \rrbracket) = \alpha_{\overline{Q_1}}(\llbracket \overline{\mathbf{b}}_i \rrbracket) = |x_i\rangle$ for $x_i \in X_1$. Similarly, for Q_2 we have, $\alpha_{\overline{Q_2}} : \llbracket \overline{Q_2} \rrbracket \rightarrow \ell^\infty(X_2)$ and $\beta_{Q_2} : \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket \rightarrow \ell^2(X_2)$ for some set X_2 . We also have that $\beta_{Q_2}(\llbracket \mathbf{b}'_i \rrbracket) = \alpha_{\overline{Q_2}}(\llbracket \overline{\mathbf{b}}'_i \rrbracket) = |x'_i\rangle$ for $x'_i \in X_2$. Consider the following:

$$\llbracket Q_1 \otimes Q_2 \rrbracket = \llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket \cong_{\beta_{Q_1} \otimes \beta_{Q_2}} \ell^2(X_1) \otimes \ell^2(X_2) \cong \ell^2(X_1 \times X_2)$$

$$\llbracket \overline{Q_1 \otimes Q_2} \rrbracket = \llbracket \overline{Q_1} \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket \overline{Q_2} \rrbracket \cong_{\alpha_{\overline{Q_1}} \otimes \alpha_{\overline{Q_2}}} \ell^\infty(X_1) \otimes \ell^\infty(X_2) \cong \ell^\infty(X_1 \times X_2)$$

The second statement holds because $\beta_{Q_1 \otimes Q_2}(\llbracket \mathbf{b}_i \otimes \mathbf{b}'_j \rrbracket) = \beta_{Q_1}(\llbracket \mathbf{b}_i \rrbracket) \otimes \beta_{Q_2}(\llbracket \mathbf{b}'_j \rrbracket) = |x_i\rangle \otimes |x'_j\rangle$. Similar statement holds for $\{\overline{\mathbf{b}}_i\}_{i \in I}$.

- $Q = Q_1 \oplus Q_2$:

By induction hypothesis we have that $\llbracket \overline{Q_1} \rrbracket \cong_{\alpha_{\overline{Q_1}}} \ell^\infty(X_1)$ and $\llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket \cong_{\beta_{Q_1}} \ell^2(X_1)$ for some set X_1 . Similarly, for Q_2 we have, $\llbracket \overline{Q_2} \rrbracket \cong_{\alpha_{\overline{Q_2}}} \ell^\infty(X_2)$ and $\llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket \cong_{\beta_{Q_2}} \ell^2(X_2)$ for some set X_2 . Consider the following:

$$\llbracket Q_1 \oplus Q_2 \rrbracket = \llbracket Q_1 \rrbracket \oplus \llbracket Q_2 \rrbracket \cong_{\beta_{Q_1} \oplus \beta_{Q_2}} \ell^2(X_1) \oplus \ell^2(X_2) \cong \ell^2(X_1 \sqcup X_2)$$

$$\llbracket \overline{Q_1 \oplus Q_2} \rrbracket = \llbracket \overline{Q_1} \rrbracket \oplus \llbracket \overline{Q_2} \rrbracket \cong_{\alpha_{\overline{Q_1}} \oplus \alpha_{\overline{Q_2}}} \ell^\infty(X_1) \oplus \ell^\infty(X_2) \cong \ell^\infty(X_1 \sqcup X_2)$$

The second statement holds because $\beta_{Q_1 \oplus Q_2}(\llbracket \text{inl } \mathbf{b}_i \rrbracket) = \text{inl}(\beta_{Q_1}(\llbracket \mathbf{b}_i \rrbracket)) = |x_i\rangle^{ext}$. Here $|x_i\rangle^{ext}$ is just the extension of the functional $|x_i\rangle$ defined on X_1 to $X_1 \sqcup X_2$ by defining it to be identically zero on whole of X_2 . Same is true for the right injection. Similar statement holds for $\{\overline{\mathbf{b}}_i\}_{i \in I}$.

Note that this argument works because we deal with separable Hilbert spaces only, and hence the set $\{\mathbf{b}_i\}_{i \in I}$ is always countable. \square

Using the above theorem, measurement is interpreted as the map $m^Q : \mathcal{B}(\llbracket Q \rrbracket) \rightarrow \llbracket Q \rrbracket$ defined as $m^Q \triangleq \alpha_Q^{op} \circ m_X^{op} \circ \mathcal{B}(\beta_Q)$.

Interpretation of Configurations. A well-formed configuration (t, u_σ, M) with $\cdot \vdash t : Q$, $\Vdash u_\sigma : (Q, Q'_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes Q'_m)$, and $x_1 : \mathcal{B}(Q'_1), \dots, x_m : \mathcal{B}(Q'_m) \vdash M : A$ is interpreted as the NCPSU morphism

$$\llbracket (t, u_\sigma, M) : A \rrbracket \triangleq \left(\mathbb{C} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{B}(\llbracket u_\sigma t \rrbracket)} \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{B}(Q'_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes Q'_m) \\ \parallel \\ \mathcal{B}(Q'_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{B}(Q'_m) \end{array} \xrightarrow{\llbracket M \rrbracket} A \right).$$

We naturally extend the interpretation defined for a *total* configuration above to a configuration with auxiliary quantum types as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{C} & \xrightarrow{\llbracket (t, u_\sigma, M) : A[Q'_1, \dots, Q'_k] \rrbracket} & \llbracket A \rrbracket \otimes \mathcal{B}(Q'_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{B}(Q'_k) \\ \mathcal{B}(\llbracket u_\sigma t \rrbracket) \downarrow & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & \uparrow \mathbb{C} \\ \mathcal{B}(Q''_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes Q''_{m+k}) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathcal{B}(Q''_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{B}(Q''_m) \otimes \mathcal{B}(Q'_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{B}(Q'_k) \end{array}$$

$\llbracket x_1 : \mathcal{B}(Q''_1), \dots, x_m : \mathcal{B}(Q''_m) \vdash M : A \rrbracket \otimes id$

We can now show that our semantic interpretation is sound with respect to single-step reduction. In order to do so, we first state and prove some auxilliary lemmas.

Lemma 6.7 (Substitution). *Given typing judgements $!\Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash V : A$, $!\Delta, \Sigma_2, x : A \vdash M : B$ and $!\Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash M[V/x] : B$ (Lemma 3.7), the following equation holds:*

$$\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2 \vdash M[V/x] : B \rrbracket = \llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_2, x : A \vdash M : B \rrbracket \circ (\llbracket !\Delta, \Sigma_1 \vdash V : A \rrbracket \otimes id) \circ split$$

Proof. Proof is by induction on the form of the term M . □

Lemma 6.8. *The following equations hold for valid typing judgements:*

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \Delta \vdash (\lambda x. M) V : A \rrbracket &= \llbracket \Delta \vdash M[V/x] : A \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \Delta \vdash let\ x \otimes y = V \otimes W\ in\ M : A \rrbracket &= \llbracket \Delta \vdash M[V/x, W/y] : A \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \Delta \vdash case\ inl(V)\ of\ \{ inl(x) \rightarrow M, inr(y) \rightarrow N \} : A \rrbracket &= \llbracket \Delta \vdash M[V/x] : A \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \Delta \vdash case\ inr(W)\ of\ \{ inl(x) \rightarrow M, inr(y) \rightarrow N \} : A \rrbracket &= \llbracket \Delta \vdash M[W/y] : A \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \Delta \vdash force(lift(M)) : A \rrbracket &= \llbracket \Delta \vdash M : A \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \Delta \vdash match\ zero\ with\ \{ zero \rightarrow M, succ(x) \rightarrow N \} : A \rrbracket &= \llbracket \Delta \vdash M : A \rrbracket \\ \llbracket \Delta \vdash match\ succ(V)\ with\ \{ zero \rightarrow M, succ(x) \rightarrow N \} : A \rrbracket &= \llbracket \Delta \vdash N[V/x] : A \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Follows from Lemma 6.7. □

Lemma 6.9. *For a quantum type \mathbf{Q} and finitely many basis terms $\{\mathbf{b}_i\}_{i \in I}$ of \mathbf{Q} , the following equation holds:*

$$\mathcal{B}^r(\llbracket \sum_i p_i \mathbf{b}_i \rrbracket) \circ \mathcal{B}^r(\beta_{\mathbf{Q}}) \circ m_X \circ \alpha_{\overline{\mathbf{Q}}} = \sum_i |p_i|^2 \llbracket \overline{\mathbf{b}_i} \rrbracket$$

provided that $\cdot \vdash \sum_i p_i \mathbf{b}_i$. Here $\mathcal{B}^r : \mathbf{Isometry} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$ is defined as $\mathcal{B}^r(H) \triangleq \mathcal{B}(H)$ on objects, and for a morphism $f \in \mathbf{Isometry}$, $\mathcal{B}^r(f)(\phi) \triangleq f^* \circ \phi \circ f$ and $\mathbf{NCPSU} = \mathbf{W}^{op}$.

Proof. It follows from the definition of the functor \mathcal{B}^r , that it suffices to show the following:

$$\mathcal{B}^r(\llbracket \mathbf{b}_i \rrbracket) \circ \mathcal{B}^r(\beta_{\mathbf{Q}}) \circ m_X \circ \alpha_{\overline{\mathbf{Q}}} = \llbracket \overline{\mathbf{b}_i} \rrbracket \quad \forall i$$

This follows from the definition of \mathcal{B}^r, m_X , Theorem 6.6 and the observation that $\{\mathbf{b}_i\}_{i \in I} = \{|x\rangle\}_{x \in X}$. □

Proposition 6.10. *For a well-formed quantum configuration $\mathcal{C} : A[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k]$, we have $\llbracket \mathcal{C} : A[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k] \rrbracket = \Sigma_{\mathcal{C}'} p \llbracket \mathcal{C}' : A[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k] \rrbracket$.*

Proof. Note that, the proof essentially reduces to proving the statement for the relation \rightarrow_p , since \leadsto_p holds after we rewrite the first component. More precisely, if \mathcal{C} doesn't reduce further, the statement holds trivially. If it does, then since the equational theory for the quantum control fragment is complete (Theorem 2.74), it suffices to show the statement for \rightarrow_p . We can assume without loss of generality that $\mathcal{C} = (\mathbf{t}, u_\sigma, M)$ for some quantum value \mathbf{t} , some unitary u_σ and some term M . Now the proof is by induction on the form of the term M . Note that if M is a value, then the above equation holds trivially. Let $\mathcal{C} = (\mathbf{t}, u_\sigma, M N)$, where M is not a value. Then we know from the contextual rule for Figure 18 that the only possible reductions take the form $(\mathbf{t}, u_\sigma, M N) \rightarrow_{p_i} (\mathbf{t}_i, u_{\sigma_i}, M_i N)$ whenever $(\mathbf{t}, u_\sigma, M) \rightarrow_{p_i} (\mathbf{t}_i, u_{\sigma_i}, M_i)$. By the induction hypothesis, we know that $\llbracket (\mathbf{t}, u_\sigma, M) \rrbracket = \sum_i p_i \llbracket (\mathbf{t}_i, u_{\sigma_i}, M_i) \rrbracket$. Hence we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket (\mathbf{t}, u_\sigma, M N) : A[\mathbf{Q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{Q}'_k] \rrbracket \\ &= \llbracket x_1, \dots, x_m : \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}_m) \vdash M N : A \rrbracket \otimes id_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}'_1) \dots} \circ \mathcal{B}(\llbracket u_\sigma \mathbf{t} \rrbracket) \\ &= ((\epsilon_{A, B} \circ (\llbracket x_1, \dots, x_j \vdash M : B \multimap A \rrbracket \otimes \llbracket x_{j+1}, \dots \vdash N : B \rrbracket)) \otimes id_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}'_1) \dots}) \circ \mathcal{B}(\llbracket \mathbf{v} \rrbracket) \\ &= ((\epsilon_{A, B} \otimes id_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}'_1) \dots}) \circ (id_{B \multimap A} \otimes \llbracket x_{j+1}, \dots \vdash N : B \rrbracket \otimes id_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}'_1) \dots})) \\ &\quad \circ (\llbracket x_1, \dots, x_j \vdash M : B \multimap A \rrbracket \otimes id_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}_{j+1}) \dots} \otimes id_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}'_1) \dots}) \circ \mathcal{B}(\llbracket u_\sigma \mathbf{t} \rrbracket) \\ &= ((\epsilon_{A, B} \otimes id_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}'_1) \dots}) \\ &\quad \circ (id_{B \multimap A} \otimes \llbracket x_{j+1}, \dots \vdash N : B \rrbracket \otimes id_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}'_1) \dots}) \circ (\sum_i p_i \llbracket (\mathbf{t}_i, u_{\sigma_i}, M_i) \rrbracket)) \otimes (id_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}'_1) \dots}) \\ &= \sum_i p_i \llbracket (\mathbf{t}_i, u_{\sigma_i}, M_i N) \rrbracket \end{aligned}$$

The case when $M N = (\lambda x. M') V$ is a consequence of 6.7. The other cases in the induction step for $M N$ follow similarly. We now prove the induction step for the term $pure(\mathbf{t})$. From Figure 18, it follows that we need this equation to hold:

$$\llbracket (\mathbf{t}, u_\sigma, pure(\mathbf{t}')) : \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}_{t'})[\mathbf{Q}_t] \rrbracket = \llbracket (\mathbf{t} \otimes \mathbf{t}', u_{\sigma_{swap}} \circ (u_\sigma \otimes u_{id}), x) : \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{Q}_{t'})[\mathbf{Q}_t] \rrbracket$$

Note the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket (t, u_\sigma, \text{pure}(t')) : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q}_{t'})[\mathcal{Q}_t] \rrbracket &= (\llbracket \cdot \vdash \text{pure}(t') : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q}_{t'}) \rrbracket \otimes id_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q}_t)}) \circ \mathcal{B}(\llbracket u_\sigma t \rrbracket) \\
&= (\mathcal{B}(\llbracket t' \rrbracket) \otimes id_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q}_t)}) \circ \mathcal{B}(\llbracket u_\sigma t \rrbracket) \\
&= (id_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q}_{t'})} \otimes id_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q}_t)}) \circ \mathcal{B}(\llbracket u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}} \circ (u_\sigma \otimes u_{id})(t \otimes t') \rrbracket) \\
&= (\llbracket x \rrbracket \otimes id_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q}_t)}) \circ \mathcal{B}(\llbracket u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}}(u_\sigma t) \otimes t' \rrbracket) \\
&= \llbracket (t \otimes t', u_{\sigma_{\text{swap}}} \circ (u_\sigma \otimes u_{id}), x) : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q}_{t'})[\mathcal{Q}_t] \rrbracket
\end{aligned}$$

The proof for the induction step for the term $\text{meas}(M)$ follows from Lemma 6.9. Rest of the cases follow using arguments similar to the above cases. \square

Theorem 6.11 (Soundness). *For $\mathcal{C} \in \text{WF}_{\text{svconf}}(A)$, if $\mathcal{C} \notin \text{VConf}$, then*

$$\llbracket \mathcal{C} : A \rrbracket = \sum_{\mathcal{C} \rightsquigarrow_p \mathcal{C}'} p \llbracket \mathcal{C}' : A \rrbracket,$$

where the sum ranges over all possible reducts $\mathcal{C} \rightsquigarrow_p \mathcal{C}'$.

Proof. Follows from Proposition 6.10. \square

Next, we can show that our interpretation is sound in a big-step sense as well, which follows easily using the previous result and strong normalisation.

Theorem 6.12 (Strong Adequacy). *For $\mathcal{C} \in \text{WF}_{\text{svconf}}(A)$,*

$$\llbracket \mathcal{C} \rrbracket = \sum_{\mathcal{V} \in \text{VConf}} P(\mathcal{C} \rightarrow_* \mathcal{V}) \llbracket \mathcal{V} \rrbracket,$$

where $P(\mathcal{C} \rightarrow_* \mathcal{V})$ indicates the overall probability that \mathcal{C} reduces to \mathcal{V} .

Proof. The result is a consequence of Theorem 3.29 and Theorem 6.11. \square

This implies that, for any well-formed configuration \mathcal{C} , its interpretation $\llbracket \mathcal{C} \rrbracket$ is an NCPU map (i.e., it is not merely subunitary) and therefore it corresponds to a quantum channel in the Heisenberg picture of quantum mechanics.

7. CONCLUSION AND PERSPECTIVES

We described a programming language which has support for both pure state quantum computation and mixed state quantum computation. We began by describing the pure quantum subsystem (§2), for which we introduced an equational theory and proved its completeness w.r.t. the denotational semantics (§2.5). Then, we described the main calculus (§3.1) which uses a new adaptation of quantum configurations (§3.2), which we used to define the operational semantics of the language. Here, the interaction between the pure quantum subsystem and the main calculus becomes apparent. We showed that our denotational semantics (§6) has a clear and appropriate interpretation as channels in the Heisenberg picture of quantum mechanics and we showed it is sound and adequate with respect to the operational semantics (§6).

Although our language has support for Nat, an inductive type, an obvious extension would be to include more general inductive types. Additionally, support for higher-order *pure* quantum computation is another feature that would be interesting to add in a future work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Benoît Valiron for helpful comments and discussions. Louis Lemonnier’s research was funded by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) under project EP/X025551/1 “Rubber DUQ: Flexible Dynamic Universal Quantum programming”. This work is supported by the the Plan France 2030 through the PEPR integrated project EPiQ ANR-22-PETQ-0007 and the HQI platform ANR-22-PNCQ-0002; and by the European Union through the MSCA SE project QCOMICAL (Grant Agreement ID: 101182520).

REFERENCES

- [AD17] Pablo Arrighi and Gilles Dowek. Lineal: A linear-algebraic lambda-calculus. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 13(1), 2017. doi:10.23638/LMCS-13(1:8)2017.
- [AM22] Pablo Andrés-Martínez. *Unbounded loops in quantum programs: categories and weak-while loops*. PhD thesis, Laboratory for Foundations of Computer Science, School of Informatics, University of Edinburgh, 2022. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2212.05371.
- [AMHK23] Pablo Andrés-Martínez, Chris Heunen, and Robin Kaarsgaard. Universal properties of partial quantum maps. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science*, 394:192–207, November 2023. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.394.11>, doi:10.4204/eptcs.394.11.
- [CCD⁺03] Andrew M Childs, Richard Cleve, Enrico Deotto, Edward Farhi, Sam Gutmann, and Daniel A Spielman. Exponential algorithmic speedup by a quantum walk. In *Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 59–68, 2003.
- [CdV20] Pierre Clairambault and Marc de Visme. Full abstraction for the quantum lambda-calculus. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 4(POPL):63:1–63:28, 2020. doi:10.1145/3371131.
- [CdVW19] Pierre Clairambault, Marc de Visme, and Glynn Winskel. Game semantics for quantum programming. *PACMPL*, 3(POPL):32:1–32:29, 2019. doi:10.1145/3290345.
- [Cha23] Kostia Chardonnet. *Towards a Curry-Howard Correspondence for Quantum Computation. (Vers une correspondance de Curry-Howard pour le calcul quantique)*. PhD thesis, Université Paris-Saclay, France, 2023. URL: <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-03959403>.
- [CHKS23] Jacques Carette, Chris Heunen, Robin Kaarsgaard, and Amr Sabry. The quantum effect: A recipe for quantumpi, 2023. arXiv:2302.01885.
- [Cho14] Kenta Cho. Semantics for a quantum programming language by operator algebras. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science*, 172:165–190, December 2014. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.172.12>, doi:10.4204/eptcs.172.12.
- [CW16] Kenta Cho and Abraham Westerbaan. Von Neumann Algebras form a Model for the Quantum Lambda Calculus, 2016. doi:10.48550/arXiv.1603.02133.
- [DCGMV19] Alejandro Díaz-Caro, Mauricio Guillermo, Alexandre Miquel, and Benoît Valiron. Realizability in the unitary sphere. In *LICS 2019*. IEEE, jun 2019. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/2Flics.2019.8785834>, doi:10.1109/lics.2019.8785834.
- [DCM22] Alejandro Díaz-Caro and Octavio Malherbe. Quantum control in the unitary sphere: Lambda-s1 and its categorical model. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, Volume 18, Issue 3, 2022. URL: <https://doi.org/10.46298/2Flmcs-18%283%3A32%292022>, doi:10.46298/lmcs-18(3:32)2022.
- [DLPZ25] Kinnari Dave, Louis Lemonnier, Romain Péchoux, and Vladimir Zamdzhiev. Combining quantum and classical control: syntax, semantics and adequacy. In Parosh Aziz Abdulla and Delia Kesner, editors, *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures*, pages 155–175, Cham, 2025. Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [DM22] Alejandro Díaz-Caro and Octavio Malherbe. Semimodules and the (syntactically-)linear lambda calculus. *CoRR*, abs/2205.02142, 2022. URL: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2205.02142>, arXiv:2205.02142, doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2205.02142.
- [dV20] Marc de Visme. *Quantum Game Semantics. (Sémantique des Jeux Quantique)*. PhD thesis, University of Lyon, France, 2020. URL: <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-03045844>.

- [GLR⁺13] Alexander S Green, Peter LeFanu Lumsdaine, Neil J Ross, Peter Selinger, and Benoît Valiron. Quipper: a scalable quantum programming language. In *Proceedings of the 34th ACM SIGPLAN conference on Programming language design and implementation*, pages 333–342, 2013.
- [Heu13] Chris Heunen. *On the Functor ℓ^2* , pages 107–121. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-381645_8.
- [HK22a] Chris Heunen and Robin Kaarsgaard. Quantum information effects. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 6(POPL), jan 2022. doi:10.1145/3498663.
- [HK22b] Chris Heunen and Andre Kornell. Axioms for the category of hilbert spaces. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(9):e2117024119, 2022.
- [HKvdS22] Chris Heunen, Andre Kornell, and NESTA van der Schaff. Axioms for the category of hilbert spaces and linear contractions, 2022. arXiv:2211.02688.
- [HV19] Chris Heunen and Jamie Vicary. *Categories for Quantum Theory: an introduction*. Oxford University Press, 2019.
- [JKL⁺22] Xiaodong Jia, Andre Kornell, Bert Lindenhovius, Michael W. Mislove, and Vladimir Zamdzhiev. Semantics for variational quantum programming. In *POPL 2022*, volume 6, pages 1–31. ACM, 2022. doi:10.1145/3498687.
- [KAG17] Robin Kaarsgaard, Holger Bock Axelsen, and Robert Glück. Join inverse categories and reversible recursion. *J. Log. Algebraic Methods Program.*, 87:33–50, 2017. doi:10.1016/j.jlamp.2016.08.003.
- [Kor17] Andre Kornell. Quantum collections. *International Journal of Mathematics*, 28(12), 2017. doi:10.1142/S0129167X17500859.
- [Lem24] Louis Lemonnier. *The Semantics of Effects : Centrality, Quantum Control and Reversible Recursion*. Theses, Université Paris-Saclay, June 2024. URL: <https://theses.hal.science/tel-04625771>.
- [MH24] Matthew Di Meglio and Chris Heunen. Dagger categories and the complex numbers: Axioms for the category of finite-dimensional hilbert spaces and linear contractions, 2024. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.06584>, arXiv:2401.06584.
- [NC10] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. *Quantum computation and quantum information*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [PPRZ20] Romain Péchoux, Simon Perdrix, Mathys Rennela, and Vladimir Zamdzhiev. Quantum programming with inductive datatypes: Causality and affine type theory. In *FoSSaCS 2020*, volume 12077 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 562–581. Springer, 2020. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-45231-5_29.
- [PRZ17] Jennifer Paykin, Robert Rand, and Steve Zdancewic. Qwire: a core language for quantum circuits. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 52(1):846–858, 2017.
- [PSV14] Michele Pagani, Peter Selinger, and Benoît Valiron. Applying quantitative semantics to higher-order quantum computing. In *POPL 2014*, pages 647–658. ACM, 2014. doi:10.1145/2535838.2535879.
- [Sel04] Peter Selinger. Towards a quantum programming language. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 14(4):527–586, 2004. doi:10.1017/S0960129504004256.
- [SV06] Peter Selinger and Benoît Valiron. A lambda calculus for quantum computation with classical control. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 16(3):527–552, 2006. doi:10.1017/S0960129506005238.
- [SV⁺09] Peter Selinger, Benoît Valiron, et al. Quantum lambda calculus. *Semantic techniques in quantum computation*, pages 135–172, 2009.
- [SVV18] Amr Sabry, Benoît Valiron, and Juliana Kaizer Vizzotto. From symmetric pattern-matching to quantum control. In *FoSSaCS 2018*, volume 10803 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 348–364. Springer, 2018. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-89366-2_19.
- [TA24] Takeshi Tsukada and Kazuyuki Asada. Enriched presheaf model of quantum FPC. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 8(POPL):362–392, 2024. doi:10.1145/3632855.
- [Tak12] Masamichi Takesaki. *Theory of Operator Algebras I*. Encyclopaedia of mathematical sciences. Springer New York, 2012.
- [Val22] Benoît Valiron. Semantics of quantum programming languages: Classical control, quantum control. *Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming*, 128, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.jlamp.2022.100790.

- [VLRH23] Finn Voichick, Liyi Li, Robert Rand, and Michael Hicks. Qunity: A unified language for quantum and classical computing. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 7(POPL):921–951, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3571225.