Assignment 2 He Anyang

Problem 2

Part 1:

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{\overline{\lambda_{_} . x \, \text{val}} \, \left(\text{D-Lam} \right)}{\overline{\{x \to D\} \vdash (\lambda \, x . \, \lambda_{_} . \, x) \, L \mapsto \lambda_{_} . \, x}} \, \frac{\text{(D-App-Done)}}{\text{(D-App-Lam)}} \\ \text{Step 1:} & \frac{\overline{\{x \to D\} \vdash (\lambda \, x . \, \lambda_{_} . \, x) \, L \, * \mapsto (\lambda_{_} . \, x) \, *}}{\varnothing \vdash (\lambda \, x . \, (\lambda \, x . \, \lambda_{_} . \, x) \, L \, *) \, D \mapsto (\lambda \, x . \, (\lambda_{_} . \, x) \, *) \, D} \, \\ \frac{x \to D \in \{x \to D, \, _ \to *\}}{\{x \to D, \, _ \to *\} \vdash x \mapsto D} \, \frac{\text{(D-Var)}}{\{x \to D\} \vdash (\lambda_{_} . \, x) \, * \mapsto (\lambda_{_} . \, D) \, *}}{\overline{\{x \to D\} \vdash (\lambda_{_} . \, x) \, * \mapsto (\lambda_{_} . \, D) \, *}} \, \frac{\text{(D-App-Body)}}{\overline{(D-App-Body)}} \\ \text{Step 2:} & \frac{D \, \text{val}}{\overline{\{x \to D\} \vdash (\lambda_{_} . \, D) \, * \mapsto D}} \, \frac{\text{(D-App-Done)}}{\overline{(D-App-Body)}} \\ \text{Step 3:} & \frac{D \, \text{val}}{\overline{\varnothing \vdash (\lambda \, x . \, (\lambda_{_} . \, D) \, *} \, D \mapsto (\lambda \, x . \, D) \, D} \, \text{(D-App-Body)} \\ \text{Step 4:} & \frac{D \, \text{val}}{\overline{\varnothing \vdash (\lambda \, x . \, D) \, D \mapsto D}} \, \frac{D \, \text{(D-App-Done)}}{\overline{(D-App-Done)}} \\ \end{array}$$

Part 2:

$$\begin{split} \frac{\Gamma, x \to e_{\text{var}} \vdash e_{\text{body}} \mapsto e'_{\text{body}}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{let } x = e_{\text{var}} \text{ in } e'_{\text{body}} \mapsto \text{let } x = e_{\text{var}} \text{ in } e'_{\text{body}}} \text{ (D-Let-Body)} \\ \frac{e_{\text{body}} \text{ val}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{let } x = e_{\text{var}} \text{ in } e_{\text{body}} \mapsto e_{\text{body}}} \text{ (D-Let-Done)} \end{split}$$

Problem 3

We claim that the let statement is type safe.

For all Γ, e, τ , assume $\Gamma, x : \tau_{\mathsf{var}} \vdash e_{\mathsf{body}} : \tau_{\mathsf{body}}, e = (\mathsf{let}\ x : \tau_{\mathsf{var}} = e_{\mathsf{var}}\ \mathsf{in}\ e_{\mathsf{body}}), \tau = \tau_{\mathsf{body}}, \mathsf{then}$:

Progress: if $e:\tau$, then either e val or there exists an e' such that $e\mapsto e'$.

Proof. By D-Let, $e \mapsto [x \to e_{\mathsf{var}}] \ e_{\mathsf{body}}$, therefore e will always step.

Preservation: if $e : \tau$ and $e \mapsto e'$ then $e' : \tau$.

Proof. There is only one way to step: by D-Let. By the substitution typing lemma, $x: \tau_{\sf var} \vdash e_{\sf body}: \tau_{\sf body} \Longrightarrow [x \to e_{\sf var}] e_{\sf body}: \tau_{\sf body}.$

rec statement is not type safe because there is no operational semantics that can be applied to $rec(e_{base}; x_{num}.x_{acc}.e_{acc})(n)$ when n < 0, so $rec(e_{base}; x_{num}.x_{acc}.e_{acc})(-1)$ is not a value, and it can not step, so it violates progress.