1. (16.2.5) By induction on declarative typing derivations. Proceed by cases on the final rule in the derivation.

   - *Case TVar*: $t = x$ and $\Gamma(x) = T$. Immediate, by $TAVar$.
   - *Case TAbs*: $t = \lambda x : T_1.t_2$, $\Gamma, x : T_1 \vdash \ t_2 : T_2$ and $T = T_1 \to T_2$. By the induction hypothesis, $\Gamma, x : T_1 \Vdash \ t_2 : S_2$, for some $S_2 <: T_2$. By $SArrow$, $T_1 \to S_2 <: T_1 \to T_2$.
   - *Case TApp*: $t = t_1 t_2$, $\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \to T_{12}$, $\Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_{11}$ and $T = T_{11}$. By the induction hypothesis, $\Gamma \Vdash t_1 : S_1$, for some $S_1 <: T_{11} \to T_{12}$ and $\ envEt_2 : S_2$, for some $S_2 <: T_{11}$. By the inversion lemma for the subtype relation, S_1 must have the form $S_{11} \to S_{12}$, for some S_{11} and S_{12} with $T_{11} <: S_{11}$ and $S_{12} <: T_{12}$. By transitivity, $S_2 <: S_{11}$. By the completeness of algorithmic subtyping, $\Vdash S_2 <: S_{11}$. Now, by $TAApp$, $\Gamma \Vdash t_1 t_2 : S_{12}$, which finishes this case (since we already have $S_{12} <: T_{12}$).
   - *CaseTRcd*: $t = \{l_i = t_i{}^{i \in 1 \cdots n}\}$, $\Gamma \vdash t_i : T_i$ for each i and $T = \{l_i : T_i{}^{i \in 1 \cdots n}\}$. By the induction hypothesis, $\Gamma \Vdash t_i : S_i$, with $S_i <: T_i$ for each i. Now, by $TARcd$, $\Gamma \Vdash \{l_i = t_i{}^{i \in 1 \cdots n}\} : \{l_i : S_i{}^{i \in 1 \cdots n}\}$. By $SRcd$ $\{l_i : S_i{}^{i \in 1 \cdots n}\} <: \{l_i : T_i{}^{i \in 1 \cdots n}\}$, which finishes this case.
   - $TProj$: $t = t_1.l_j$, $\Gamma \vdash t_1 : \{l_i : T_i^{i \in 1 \cdots n}\}$ and $T = T_j$. By the induction hypothesis, $\Gamma \Vdash t_1 : S$, with $S <: \{l_i : T_i^{i \in 1 \cdots n}\}$. By the inversion lemma in subtyping relation, S must have the form $\{k_i : S_i^{i \in 1 \cdots m}\}$, with at least the labels $\{l_i{}^{i \in 1 \cdots n}\}$ i.e., $\{l_i^{i \in 1 \cdots n}\} \subseteq \{k_j{}^{j \in 1 \cdots m}\}$, with $S_j <: T_i$ for each common label $l_i = k_j$. By $SARcd$ $\Gamma \Vdash t_1.t_j : S_j$, which finishes this case (since we already have $S_j <: T_j$).
   - *Case TSub*: $\Gamma \vdash t : S$ and $S <: T$. By the induction hypothesis and transitivity of subtyping.

2. (16.2.6) If we dropped the arrow subtyping rule $S - Arrow$ but kept the rest of the declarative subtyping and typing rules the same, the system do not still have the minimal typing property. For example, the term $\lambda x : \{a : Nat\}.x$ has both the types $\{a : Nat\} \to \{a : Nat\}$ and $\{a : Nat\} \to Top$ under the declarative rules. With the algorithmic typing has the type $\{a : Nat\} \to \{a : Nat\}$, but without $S - Arrow$, this type is incomparable with $\{a : Nat\} \to Top$.

3. (16.3.3) The minimal type of if $true$ then $false$ else $\{\ \}$ is Top, the join of $Bool$ and $\{\ \}$. However, it is hard to imagine that the programmer really intended to write this expression, after all, no operations can be performed on a value of type Top.

4. (14.3.1)

Syntax

t	$::=$		*terms* :
		x	*variable*
		$\lambda x : T.t$	*abstraction*
		$t\ t$	*application*
		rise $(< l = t >$ as $T)$	*rise exception*
		try t with $\lambda x : T.$ case x of	*handle exception*
v	$::=$		*values* :
		$\lambda x : T.t$	*abstraction value*
		$\{l_i = v_i^{i \in 1 \cdots n}\}$	*record value*
T	$::=$		*types* :
		$T \to T$	*type of functions*
		$\{l_i = T_i^{i \in 1 \cdots n}\}$	*type of record*
Γ	$::=$		*contexts* :
		$\varnothing$	*empty context* :
		$\Gamma, x : T$	*term variable binding*