Semantics of Functional Programming

Lecture I: **PCF** and its Operational Semantics

Chen, Liang-Ting
lxc@iis.sinica.edu.tw

Institute of Information Science, Academia Sinica

Formosan Summer School on Logic, Language, and Computation
2014

The meaning of programs

How can we tell if a program is correct?

1. The meaning of a program is ideally independent of its actual implementation.
2. A rigorous specification of language is essential. Everything must be defined without any ambiguities. No undefined behaviour.
3. A structural approach to semantics. The meaning of a program is built from its parts, so verification is possible.
4. The precise definitions of notions, such as strict and lazy evaluation strategies.

Two approaches to be taught

1. **Operational approach**: How values and functions are computed? E.g., for $\mathtt{add} : \mathtt{nat} \to \mathtt{nat} \to \mathtt{nat}$ and numerals $\underline{2}$, $\underline{4}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathtt{add}\ \underline{2}\ \underline{4} \rightsquigarrow \mathtt{suc}\ (\mathtt{add}\ \underline{1}\ \underline{4}) \\ \rightsquigarrow\ & \mathtt{suc}\ \mathtt{suc}(\mathtt{add}\ \underline{0}\ \underline{4}) \rightsquigarrow \mathtt{suc}\ \mathtt{suc}\ \underline{4} \equiv \underline{6} \end{aligned}$$

2. **Denotational approach**: What the values and functions are? The set $\mathbb{N}_\perp$ of natural numbers with *divergence* $\perp$ is the denotation of the type $\mathtt{nat}$, e.g.,

$$\begin{aligned} [\![\mathtt{add}\ \underline{2}\ \underline{4}]\!] &= [\![\mathtt{add}\ \underline{2}]\!]\ [\![\underline{4}]\!] = ([\![\mathtt{add}]\!]\ [\![\underline{2}]\!])\ 4 \\ &= (x \mapsto 2 + x)\ 4 = 2 + 4 = 6 \end{aligned}$$

where $[\![\mathtt{add}]\!] : \mathbb{N}_\perp \to (\mathbb{N}_\perp \to \mathbb{N}_\perp)$.

What is PCF?

PCF stands for **Programming Computable Functionals**,

1. an extension of simply typed lambda calculus with `nat` and general recursion;
2. extremely simple compared to modern programming languages;
3. Turing complete, i.e. every computable function on natural numbers can be defined in **PCF**.

Syntax of PCF

Definition

Types in **PCF** are defined by the inference rules

$$\frac{}{\texttt{nat}\ \textbf{set}} \qquad \frac{\tau_1\ \textbf{set} \qquad \tau_2\ \textbf{set}}{\tau_1 \to \tau_2\ \textbf{set}}$$

or equivalently by the grammar $\tau \coloneqq \texttt{nat} \mid \tau \to \tau$.

Definition

The collection of terms in **PCF** is defined inductively:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{M} \coloneqq x \mid \lambda x.\, \mathsf{M} \mid \mathsf{M}\ \mathsf{N} \mid \texttt{zero} \mid \texttt{suc}\ \mathsf{M} \\ \mid \texttt{ifz}(\mathsf{M}; \mathsf{M}; x.\, \mathsf{M}) \mid \texttt{Y}x.\, \mathsf{M} \end{aligned}$$

where x is a variable.

The operator $\texttt{Y}$ is called the **fixpoint operator**, or **general recursion**.

Typing Rules for PCF

A **judgement** $\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{M} : \tau$ denotes that M has type τ under the context Γ.
PCF consists of

- simply typed lambda calculus (with $\to$ only):

$$\frac{}{\Gamma, x : \sigma, \Delta \vdash x : \sigma}\ (\mathrm{var})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma \vdash \mathsf{M} : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x.\, \mathsf{M} : \sigma \to \tau}\ (\mathrm{abs})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{M} : \sigma \to \tau \qquad \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{N} : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{M}\ \mathsf{N} : \tau}\ (\mathrm{app})$$

- the type of natural numbers:

$$\frac{}{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{zero} : \mathtt{nat}}\ (\mathrm{z})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{M} : \mathtt{nat}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{suc}\ \mathsf{M} : \mathtt{nat}}\ (\mathrm{s})$$

- **if zero** test: it is meant to be the *case analysis* on natural numbers:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{M} : \mathtt{nat} \quad \Gamma \vdash \mathsf{M}_0 : \tau \quad \Gamma, x : \mathtt{nat} \vdash \mathsf{M}_1 : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{ifz}(\mathsf{M}; \mathsf{M}_0; x.\, \mathsf{M}_1) : \tau} \ (\mathsf{ifz})$$

- **general recursion** (to be explained):

$$\frac{\Gamma, x : \sigma \vdash \mathsf{M} : \sigma}{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{Y}x.\, \mathsf{M} : \sigma} \ (\mathsf{Y})$$

Definition

A term M of type τ is called a **program** of type τ in **PCF** if it is derivable under an empty context, i.e. the judgement

$$() \vdash \mathsf{M} : \tau$$

is derivable where () denotes the empty context for emphasis.

E.g. $\mathtt{Y}x.\, \mathtt{suc}\ x$ and $\mathtt{ifz}(\mathtt{zero}; \lambda x.\, \mathtt{zero}; y.\, \lambda z.\, y)$ are programs, but $\lambda y.\, x\ y$ or $\mathtt{suc}\ (\lambda x.\, \mathtt{suc}\ x)$ are not.

Example: Predecessor

The predecessor of natural numbers can be defined as

$$\mathtt{pred} \coloneqq \lambda x.\, \mathtt{ifz}(x; \mathtt{zero}; y.\, y) : \mathtt{nat} \to \mathtt{nat}$$

with the following typing derivation:

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{}{\Gamma \vdash x : \mathtt{nat}} \quad \dfrac{}{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{zero} : \mathtt{nat}} \quad \dfrac{}{\Gamma, y : \mathtt{nat} \vdash y : \mathtt{nat}}}{\dfrac{\Gamma \vdash \mathtt{ifz}(x; \mathtt{zero}; y.\, y) : \mathtt{nat}}{\vdash \lambda x.\, \mathtt{ifz}(x; \mathtt{zero}; y.\, y) : \mathtt{nat} \to \mathtt{nat}}}$$

where $\Gamma \coloneqq x : \mathtt{nat}$.

One-step reduction

Definition

A **closed value** denoted **val** is one of the following:

$$\frac{}{\texttt{zero}\ \textbf{val}} \qquad \frac{\mathsf{M}\ \textbf{val}}{\texttt{suc}\ \mathsf{M}\ \textbf{val}} \qquad \frac{}{\lambda x.\,\mathsf{M}\ \textbf{val}}$$

A value is meant to be the final result of computation. For example, natural numbers $\texttt{zero}$, $\texttt{suc}\ \texttt{zero}$ and lambda functions $\lambda x.\,x$ etc. This formulation also includes ill-typed terms such as $\texttt{suc}\ (\lambda x.\,\mathsf{M})$.

Notation

The notation $\rightsquigarrow$ is a relation between terms, denoted

$$\mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow \mathsf{M}'$$

which means that the term M reduces to M′ in *one step*.

Reduction of general recursion and natural numbers

For general recursion, each occurrence of $\mathtt{Y}.\,\mathsf{M}$ reduces to an substitution of x in M by itself:

$$\frac{}{\mathtt{Y}x.\,\mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow \mathsf{M}[\mathtt{Y}x.\,M/x]}\ (\rightsquigarrow\text{-fix})$$

For the *eager evaluation*, $\mathtt{suc}$ M reduces to $\mathtt{suc}$ M' if M reduces to M'

$$\frac{\mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow \mathsf{M}'}{\mathtt{suc}\ \mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow \mathtt{suc}\ \mathsf{M}'}\ (\rightsquigarrow\text{-}\mathtt{suc})$$

On the other hand, it is possible to defer the evaluation of natural numbers, and this evaluation is known as the *lazy evaluation*. To do so, we simply remove this reduction rule $\rightsquigarrow$-$\mathtt{suc}$ and modify the definition of closed values for $\mathtt{suc}$ to

$$\frac{}{\mathtt{suc}\ \mathsf{M}\ \ \textbf{val}}$$

without any assumptions.

Reduction of `ifz`

For the if-zero test, the first argument must be reduced to a closed value before branching, but branching can be done before the evaluation on branches:

$$\frac{\mathsf{M} \leadsto \mathsf{M}'}{\texttt{ifz}(\mathsf{M}; \mathsf{M}_0; x.\,\mathsf{M}_1) \leadsto \texttt{ifz}(\mathsf{M}'; \mathsf{M}_0; x.\,\mathsf{M}_1)}\;(\leadsto\text{-}\texttt{ifz})$$

$$\frac{}{\texttt{ifz}(\texttt{zero}; \mathsf{M}_0; x.\,\mathsf{M}_1) \leadsto \mathsf{M}_0}\;(\leadsto\text{-}\texttt{ifz}_0)$$

$$\frac{\texttt{suc}\ \mathsf{M}\ \ \textbf{val}}{\texttt{ifz}(\texttt{suc}\ \mathsf{M}; \mathsf{M}_0; x.\,\mathsf{M}_1) \leadsto \mathsf{M}_1[\mathsf{M}/x]}\;(\leadsto\text{-}\texttt{ifz}_1)$$

Reduction for application: call-by-name and call-by-value

In call-by-name evaluation, arguments are substituted directly into the function body. It is a non-strict evaluation strategy, because application with non-terminating arguments can be terminating.

$$\frac{\mathsf{M} \leadsto \mathsf{M}'}{\mathsf{M}\ \mathsf{N} \leadsto \mathsf{M}'\ \mathsf{N}}\ (\leadsto\text{-lapp})$$

$$\frac{}{(\lambda x.\, \mathsf{M})\ \mathsf{N} \leadsto \mathsf{M}[\mathsf{N}/x]}\ (\leadsto\text{-by-name})$$

In call-by-value evaluation, each argument is evaluated before application, so we replace ($\leadsto$-by-name) by the following two rules. It is a strict evaluation strategy, as non-terminating arguments always lead to non-terminating terms.

$$\frac{\mathsf{M}\ \textbf{val} \qquad \mathsf{N} \leadsto \mathsf{N}'}{\mathsf{M}\ \mathsf{N} \leadsto \mathsf{M}'\ \mathsf{N}}\ (\leadsto\text{-by-value-1})$$

$$\frac{\mathsf{N}\ \textbf{val}}{(\lambda x.\, \mathsf{M})\ \mathsf{N} \leadsto \mathsf{M}[\mathsf{N}/x]}\ (\leadsto\text{-by-value-2})$$

In the following context, we adopt the *call-by-name* interpretation.

Many-step reduction

Definition

The relation $\rightsquigarrow^*$ between terms is defined inductively:

$$\frac{}{\mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow^* \mathsf{M}} \qquad\qquad \frac{\mathsf{M}_1 \rightsquigarrow \mathsf{M}_2 \quad \mathsf{M}_2 \rightsquigarrow^* \mathsf{M}_3}{\mathsf{M}_1 \rightsquigarrow^* \mathsf{M}_3}$$

Note that $M \rightsquigarrow^* \mathsf{M}'$ if M' is reachable from M after finitely many steps of reduction, i.e. $\mathsf{M} = \mathsf{M}_0 \rightsquigarrow \mathsf{M}_1 \rightsquigarrow \cdots \mathsf{M}_k = \mathsf{M}'$.

Proposition

The relation $\rightsquigarrow^*$ is reflexive and transitive.

Proof.

Easy exercise. $\square$

Example: Calculating the factorials

To define the factorials, we are seeking for a function `fact` satisfying

$$\texttt{fact}\colon n \mapsto \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n = 1 \\ n \times \texttt{fact}(n') & \text{if } n = n' + 1 \end{cases}$$

and this can be understood as a fixpoint of the functional F mapping $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ to $f' : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ defined by

$$f'\colon n \mapsto \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = 0 \\ n \times f(n') & \text{if } n = n' + 1 \end{cases}$$

where f' does not depend on itself.

Under the context of $\Gamma := f : \texttt{nat} \to \texttt{nat}$, we define a function depending on f as follows:

$$\Gamma \vdash \lambda n.\, \texttt{ifz}(n; \texttt{suc zero}; m.\, n \times (f\ m)) : \texttt{nat} \to \texttt{nat}$$

and thus we derive its fixpoint by $\texttt{Y}$:

$$\texttt{fact} := \texttt{Y}f.\, \lambda n.\, \texttt{ifz}(n; \texttt{suc zero}; m.\, n \times (f\ m))$$

where the term $\texttt{suc zero}$ represents the natural number 1.

Example

Let $\underline{0} := \texttt{zero}$ and $\underline{n+1} := \texttt{suc}\ \underline{n}$. We calculate $\texttt{fact}\ \underline{2}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{fact}\ \underline{2} &\rightsquigarrow (\lambda n.\, \texttt{ifz}(n; \underline{1}; m.\, n \times (\texttt{fact}\ m)))\ \underline{2} \\
&\rightsquigarrow \texttt{ifz}(\underline{2}; \underline{1}; m.\, \underline{2} \times (\texttt{fact}\ m)) \\
&\rightsquigarrow \underline{2} \times (\texttt{fact}\ \underline{1}) \\
&\rightsquigarrow \underline{2} \times (\lambda n.\, \texttt{ifz}(n; \underline{1}; m.\, n \times (\texttt{fact}\ m))\ \underline{1}) \\
&\rightsquigarrow \cdots \rightsquigarrow \underline{2} \times (\underline{1} \times \underline{1}) \rightsquigarrow^{*} \underline{2}
\end{aligned}$$

where the definition of $\times : \texttt{nat} \to \texttt{nat} \to nat$ is left as an exercise.

In-class exercise

Try to be familiar with $\texttt{ifz}$.

1. Calculate $\texttt{pred}\ \mathsf{M}$ for $\mathsf{M}\ \textbf{val}$ to closed values with their derivations:
   For the base case $\texttt{zero}$:

   $$\texttt{pred}\ \texttt{zero} \leadsto^* ?$$

   For the inductive case $\mathsf{M} = \texttt{suc}\ \mathsf{N}$:

   $$\frac{\texttt{suc}\ \mathsf{N}\ \ \textbf{val}}{\texttt{pred}\ (\texttt{suc}\ \mathsf{N}) \leadsto^* ?}$$

2. Define $\texttt{flip} : \texttt{nat} \to \texttt{nat}$ such that $\texttt{flip}\ \texttt{zero} \leadsto^* \texttt{suc}\ \texttt{zero}$ and $\texttt{flip}\ (\texttt{suc}\ \mathsf{M}) \leadsto^* \texttt{zero}$.

In-class exercise: `fold` on natural numbers

`fold` on natural numbers is defined in Haskell as follows:

```
fold :: (a -> a) -> a -> Integer -> a
fold f e 0 = e
fold f e n = f (fold f e (n - 1))
```

By modifying the definition of `fact`, give the corresponding term of `fold` in **PCF**.

Progress Theorem

Every well-typed is either a closed value or a reducible term.

Theorem

If $\vdash \mathsf{M} : \tau$ *then either* M *is a closed value or there exists* M' *such that* $\mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow \mathsf{M}'$*.*

Proof.

By induction on the derivation of $\vdash \mathsf{M} : \tau$. For the case that

$$\frac{\mathsf{M} : \mathtt{nat}}{\vdash \mathtt{suc}\ \mathsf{M} : \mathtt{nat}}$$

M is either a closed value or a reducible term by induction hypothesis:

1. If M is a closed value, then $\mathtt{suc}\ \mathsf{M}$ is also a closed value by definition.
2. Suppose that $\mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow \mathsf{M}'$ for some M'. Then, by the rule ($\rightsquigarrow$-$\mathtt{suc}$), we also have $\mathtt{suc}\ \mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow \mathtt{suc}\ \mathsf{M}'$.

$\square$

Proofs are programs

Remark

Note that given a program $\mathsf{M} : \tau$, the previous proof produces either a closed value or a **PCF** term M' with a proof that M reduces to M'. Forgetting the proof, the proof itself is indeed a program which asks a **PCF** term, preforms a single reduction and return a term tagged either `done` or `not yet`.

Substitution Lemma

If a variable $x : \tau$ in a term M is substituted by another term N of the same type, then the type of the resulting term remains.

Lemma

If $\Gamma, x : \sigma \vdash \mathsf{M} : \tau$ *and* $\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{N} : \sigma$, *then* $\Gamma \vdash \mathsf{M}[\mathsf{N}/x] : \tau$.

Proof.

Induction on the derivation of $\Gamma, x : \sigma \vdash \mathsf{M} : \tau$. Suppose that $\Gamma, x : \sigma \vdash \mathsf{M} : \tau$ is derived from

$$\frac{}{\Delta, y : \tau, x : \sigma \vdash y : \tau}\ (\mathsf{var})$$

that is, $\Gamma = \Delta, y : \tau$ and $\mathsf{M} = y$ for some variable y. Then, we need to show that $\Delta, y : \tau \vdash y[\mathsf{N}/x] : \tau$.

1. If $x = y$, then $y[\mathsf{N}/x] = \mathsf{N} : \sigma$ and $\sigma = \tau$.
2. Otherwise, $x \neq y$, then $y[\mathsf{N}/x] = y : \tau$.

Other cases follow similarly. □

Preservation Theorem

The one-step evaluation preserves types. This property is also called **Subject Reduction**.

Theorem

If $\vdash \mathsf{M} : \tau$ *and* $\mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow \mathsf{N}$ *then* $\vdash \mathsf{N} : \tau$*.*

Proof.

We prove it by induction on the derivation of $\vdash \mathsf{M} : \tau$ and $\mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow \mathsf{M}'$. For the case that

$$\frac{x : \sigma \vdash \mathsf{M} : \sigma}{\vdash \Upsilon x.\, \mathsf{M} : \sigma}$$

we do induction on $\rightsquigarrow$, but there is exactly one rule applicable:

$$\frac{}{\Upsilon x.\, \mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow \mathsf{M}[\Upsilon x.\, \mathsf{M}/x]}\ (\rightsquigarrow\text{-fix})$$

By Substitution Lemma, it follows that $\vdash M[\Upsilon x.\, M/x] : \sigma$, and other cases follow similarly. $\square$

Call-by-name big-step semantics

Instead of the one-step reduction relation $\rightsquigarrow$, we turn to the **big-step** reduction relation $\Downarrow$, formulating the notion that a term M reduce to its final value V.

$$\frac{}{\texttt{zero} \Downarrow \texttt{zero}}\ (\Downarrow\text{-zero}) \qquad \frac{\mathsf{M} \Downarrow \mathsf{V}}{\texttt{suc}\ \mathsf{M} \Downarrow \texttt{suc}\ \mathsf{V}}\ (\Downarrow\text{-suc})$$

$$\frac{}{\lambda x.\, \mathsf{M} \Downarrow \lambda x.\, \mathsf{M}}\ (\Downarrow\text{-lam}) \qquad \frac{\mathsf{M} \Downarrow \lambda x.\, \mathsf{E} \qquad \mathsf{E}[\mathsf{N}/x] \Downarrow \mathsf{V}}{\mathsf{M}\ \mathsf{N} \Downarrow \mathsf{V}}\ (\Downarrow\text{-app})$$

$$\frac{\mathsf{M} \Downarrow \texttt{zero} \qquad \mathsf{M}_0 \Downarrow \mathsf{V}}{\texttt{ifz}(\mathsf{M}; \mathsf{M}_0; x.\, \mathsf{M}_1) \Downarrow \mathsf{V}}\ (\Downarrow\text{-}\texttt{ifz}_0) \qquad \frac{\mathsf{M} \Downarrow \texttt{suc}\ \mathsf{N} \qquad \mathsf{M}_1[\mathsf{N}/x] \Downarrow \mathsf{V}}{\texttt{ifz}(\mathsf{M}; \mathsf{M}_0; x.\, \mathsf{M}_1) \Downarrow \mathsf{V}}\ (\Downarrow\text{-}\texttt{ifz}_1)$$

$$\frac{\mathsf{M}[\texttt{Y}x.\, \mathsf{M}/x] \Downarrow \mathsf{V}}{\texttt{Y}x.\, \mathsf{M} \Downarrow \mathsf{V}}\ (\Downarrow\text{-fix})$$

Closed values

We shell justify the intended meaning: whenever $\mathsf{M} \Downarrow \mathsf{V}$, the term V is always a closed value:

Lemma

For every terms M *and* V, *the term* V *is a closed value if* $\mathsf{M} \Downarrow \mathsf{V}$.

Proof.

By induction on the formulation of $\mathsf{M} \Downarrow \mathsf{V}$. □

Moreover, a closed value reduces to itself:

Lemma

If V *is a closed value, then* $\mathsf{V} \Downarrow \mathsf{V}$.

Proof.

By structural induction on V **val**. That is, it is sufficient to check that $\mathtt{zero} \Downarrow \mathtt{zero}$, $\lambda x.\, \mathsf{M} \Downarrow \lambda x.\, \mathsf{M}$; $\mathtt{suc}\ \mathsf{M} \Downarrow \mathtt{suc}\ \mathsf{M}$ if $\mathsf{M} \Downarrow \mathsf{M}$ by induction hypothesis. □

Agreement of big-step and one-step semantics

Indeed, the big-step reduction can be characterised with respect to the one-step step reduction as follows:

Theorem

For every term M *and* V, $\mathsf{M} \Downarrow \mathsf{V}$ *if and only if* $\mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow^{*} \mathsf{V}$ *with* V **val**.

Proof Sketch.

1. First we show that if $\mathsf{M} \Downarrow \mathsf{V}$ then $\mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow^{*} \mathsf{V}$ by induction on $\Downarrow$ and $\rightsquigarrow^{*}$.
2. Second, by induction on $\rightsquigarrow$ and $\Downarrow$ we show that

$$\frac{\mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow \mathsf{N} \Downarrow \mathsf{V}}{\mathsf{M} \Downarrow \mathsf{V}}$$

3. Finally, by induction on $\rightsquigarrow^{*}$ we show that

$$\frac{\mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow^{*} \mathsf{N} \Downarrow \mathsf{V}}{\mathsf{M} \Downarrow \mathsf{V}}$$

In particular, for every $\mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow^{*} \mathsf{V}$ with V **val**, we always have $\mathsf{V} \Downarrow \mathsf{V}$, so it follows $\mathsf{M} \Downarrow \mathsf{V}$.

Proof.

1. We show the case ($\Downarrow$-fix), which is similar to other cases:

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{}{\mathtt{Y}x.\,\mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow \mathsf{M}[\mathtt{Y}x.\,\mathsf{M}/x]} \qquad \dfrac{}{M[\mathtt{Y}x.\,\mathsf{M}/x] \rightsquigarrow^* \mathsf{V}}}{\mathtt{Y}x.\,\mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow^* \mathsf{V}}$$

   and by assumption V has no further reduction.

2. We show the case ($\rightsquigarrow$-fix), which is similar to other cases. By hypothesis, we have $\mathtt{Y}x.\,\mathsf{M} \rightsquigarrow \mathsf{M}[\mathtt{Y}x.\,\mathsf{M}/x]$. If $\mathsf{M}[\mathtt{Y}x.\,\mathsf{M}/x] \Downarrow \mathsf{V}$, then by ($\Downarrow$-fix) it follows that $\mathtt{Y}x.\,\mathsf{M} \Downarrow \mathsf{V}$.

3. Induction on $\rightsquigarrow^*$.

□

By the agreement of big-step and one-step semantics, we easily conclude that the Subject Reduction also holds for big-step semantics:

Corollary

If $\vdash \mathsf{M} : \tau$ *and* $\mathsf{M} \Downarrow \mathsf{V}$ *then* $\vdash \mathsf{V} : \tau$*.*