CIS 500 — Software Foundations

Final Exam

Review questions with answers

December 11, 2007

Work each of the review problems yourself before looking at the answers given here. If your answer differs from ours, make sure you understand why.
Subtyping

The questions in this section concern the simply typed lambda-calculus with records and subtyping. For reference, the definition of this language appears on page 18 at the end.

1. Circle T or F for each of the following statements.
   (a) There exists a type that is a supertype of every other type.
      \[ T \quad F \]
   (b) There exists a type that is a subtype of every other type.
      \[ T \quad F \]
   (c) There exists a record type that is a subtype of every other record type.
      \[ T \quad F \]
   (d) There exists a record type that is a supertype of every other record type.
      \[ T \quad F \]
   (e) There exists an arrow type that is a subtype of every other arrow type.
      \[ T \quad F \]
   (f) There exists an arrow type that is a supertype of every other arrow type.
      \[ T \quad F \]
   (g) There is an infinite descending chain of distinct types in the subtype relation—that is, an infinite sequence of types \( S_0, S_1, \ldots \), such that all the \( S_i \)'s are different and each \( S_{i+1} \) is a subtype of \( S_i \).
      \[ T \quad F \]
   (h) There is an infinite ascending chain of distinct types in the subtype relation—that is, an infinite sequence of types \( S_0, S_1, \ldots \), such that all the \( S_i \)'s are different and each \( S_{i+1} \) is a supertype of \( S_i \).
      \[ T \quad F \]
2. What is the smallest type $T$ ("smallest" in the subtype relation) that makes the following assertion true?

$$\text{empty} \vdash (\forall r.[[x^T]], r.x) @ [[x = (\forall z.A, z)] \sim A \rightarrow A$$

Answer:

$$T = A \rightarrow A$$

3. What is the largest type $T$ that makes the same assertion true?

Answer:

$$T = A \rightarrow A$$

4. What is the smallest type $T$ that makes the following assertion true?

$$\text{empty} \vdash (\forall r.[[x^A \rightarrow A]], [[y = (\forall z.B, z); r]], r.x) @ [[x = (\forall z.A, z)] \sim T$$

Answer:

$$T = [[y^{\text{Top} \rightarrow B}, x^{\text{Top} \rightarrow A}]]$$

or

$$T = [[x^{\text{Top} \rightarrow A}, y^{\text{Top} \rightarrow B}]]$$

5. What is the largest type $T$ that makes the same assertion true?

Answer:

$$T = \text{Top}$$

6. What is the smallest type $T$ that makes the following assertion true?

$$[[a, A]] \vdash (\forall r.[[x^A; T]], r.y \& r.x) @ [[y = (\forall z.A, z), x = a]] \sim A$$

Answer:

$$T = [[y^{\text{Top} \rightarrow A}, x^A]]$$

or

$$T = [[x^A, y^A \rightarrow \text{Top}]]$$

7. What is the largest type $T$ that makes the same assertion true?

Answer: The same.

8. What is the smallest type $T$ that makes the following assertion true?

$$\exists S, \exists t, \text{empty} \vdash (\forall r.[[x^T]], r.x @ r.x) @ t \sim S$$

Answer: There is no type $T$ that makes this assertion true.
9. Recall the following properties of the simply typed lambda-calculus with subtyping:

\[
\text{Theorem preservation : } \forall t, t', T, \quad \begin{align*}
\emptyset & \vdash t \sim T \\
\Rightarrow & \quad \text{eval } t t' \\
\Rightarrow & \quad \emptyset \vdash t' \sim T.
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{Theorem progress : } \forall t, T, \quad \begin{align*}
\emptyset & \vdash t \sim T \\
\Rightarrow & \quad \text{value } t \lor \exists t', \text{eval } t t'.
\end{align*}
\]

Each part of this problem suggests a different way of changing the language. (These changes are not cumulative: each part starts from the original language.) In each part, indicate (by circling TRUE or FALSE) whether each property remains true or becomes false after the suggested change. If a property becomes false, give a counterexample.

(a) Suppose we add the following typing rule:

\[
\begin{align*}
| T_{\text{Funny1}} : & \forall \Gamma t S_1 S_2 T_1 T_2, \\
& \Gamma \vdash t \sim S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \\
& \Rightarrow S_1 \subseteq S_2 \\
& \Rightarrow S_2 \subseteq S_1 \\
& \Rightarrow S_2 \subseteq T_2 \\
& \Rightarrow \Gamma \vdash t \sim T_1 \rightarrow T_2
\end{align*}
\]

**Progress:** Answer: True

**Preservation:** Answer: True

(b) Suppose we add the following evaluation rule:

\[
| E_{\text{Funny}} : \forall x, \\
& \Rightarrow \text{eval } [\Box] (\lambda x \sim \text{Top}, x).
\]

**Progress:** Answer: True

**Preservation:** Answer: False: for example, \([\Box]\) has type \([\Box]\) but steps to \((\lambda x \sim \text{Top}, x)\), which does not have type \([\Box]\).

(c) Suppose we add the following subtyping rule:

\[
| S_{\text{Funny}} : \\
& [\Box] \subseteq \text{Top} \rightarrow \text{Top}
\]

**Progress:** Answer: False: for example, \([\Box]\) (\(\lambda x \sim \text{Top}, \text{Top}\)) is well typed but stuck.

**Preservation:** Answer: True

(d) Suppose we add the following subtyping rule:

\[
| S_{\text{Funny}} : \\
& \text{Top} \rightarrow \text{Top} \subseteq [\Box]
\]

**Progress:** Answer: True

**Preservation:** Answer: True
10. Recall the $S_{\text{Arrow}}$ subtyping rule:

| $S_{\text{Arrow}} : \forall S_1 S_2 T_1 T_2,$
  | $T_1 <: S_1$
  | $\rightarrow S_2 <: T_2$
  | $\rightarrow S_1 --> S_2 <: T_1 --> T_2$

What happens to preservation and progress if we change this rule to the following?

| $S_{\text{Arrow}} : \forall S_1 S_2 T_1 T_2,$
  | $S_1 <: T_1$
  | $\rightarrow S_2 <: T_2$
  | $\rightarrow S_1 --> S_2 <: T_1 --> T_2$

Answer: Preservation becomes false. For example, $(\text{r}^{-}[\text{x}:A], \text{r}#\text{x}) \odot [\text{[]}\text{]}\text{]}$ has type $A$, but it steps to $[\text{[]}\text{]}\text{]}#\text{x}$, which is ill-typed.

Progress remains true.

11. In the file lec 2021.v after the proof of Lemma drop_duplicate_binding, there is the following comment:

(*) Note that we have to prove this by induction on typing derivations, not on terms as we did before. OPTIONAL EXERCISE: Why? *)

Briefly explain.

Answer: If we perform induction on terms, we will then need to use inversion on the given typing derivation to get at its constituent parts; but we will get stuck in the $T_{\text{Sub}}$ case of this inversion, which will give us a subderivation for the same term $t$, whereas the IH will always involve terms smaller than $t$. 
12. Are the following statements true or false? (Circle T or F.)

(a) \((C \rightarrow C) \rightarrow [(x \rightarrow A \rightarrow A), (y \rightarrow B \rightarrow B)] \lessdot (C \rightarrow C) \rightarrow [(y \rightarrow B \rightarrow B)]\)
\[\begin{array}{c}
T \\
F
\end{array}\]

(b) \([[]] \rightarrow [[]] \lessdot [x \rightarrow A] \rightarrow \text{Top}\)
\[\begin{array}{c}
T \\
F
\end{array}\]

(c) \(\forall S, T,\)
\(S \lessdot T\)
\(\rightarrow S \rightarrow S \lessdot T \rightarrow T\)
\[\begin{array}{c}
T \\
F
\end{array}\]

(d) \(\forall S, T,\)
\(S \lessdot A \rightarrow A\)
\(\rightarrow \exists T,\)
\(S = T \rightarrow T \land T \lessdot A\)
\[\begin{array}{c}
T \\
F
\end{array}\]

(e) \(\forall S, T_1, T_2,\)
\(S \lessdot T_1 \rightarrow T_2\)
\(\rightarrow \exists S_1, S_2,\)
\(S = S_1 \rightarrow S_2 \land T_1 \lessdot S_1 \land S_2 \lessdot T_2\)
\[\begin{array}{c}
T \\
F
\end{array}\]

(f) \(\exists S,\)
\(S \lessdot S \rightarrow S\)
\[\begin{array}{c}
T \\
F
\end{array}\]

(g) \(\exists S,\)
\(S \rightarrow S \lessdot S\)
\[\begin{array}{c}
T \\
F
\end{array}\]

(h) \(\forall S, T_2, T_2,\)
\(S \lessdot [[k \rightarrow T_1; T_2]]\)
\(\rightarrow \exists S_1, S_2,\)
\(S = [[k \rightarrow S_1; S_2]] \land S_1 \lessdot T_1 \land S_2 \lessdot T_2\)
\[\begin{array}{c}
T \\
F
\end{array}\]
13. In Lecture 18, we defined product types and the associated term constructors pairing, first projection, and second projection as follows:

Inductive ty : Set :=
  ...
  | ty_prod : ty -> ty -> ty.

Inductive tm : Set :=
  ...
  | tm_pair : tm -> tm -> tm
  | tm_proj1 : tm -> tm
  | tm_proj2 : tm -> tm.

We also introduced the notation [[T1,T2]] for tm_prod T1 T2.

Without looking back at Lecture 18, write down the typing and evaluation rules for products. Also, write down an appropriate subtyping rule for products.

Answer:

Inductive eval : tm -> tm -> Prop :=
  ...
  | E_PairBeta1 : forall t1 t2, value t1 -> value t2 -> eval (tm_pair t1 t2) t1
  | E_PairBeta2 : forall t1 t2, value t1 -> value t2 -> eval (tm_pair t1 t2) t2
  | E_Proj1 : forall t t', eval t t' -> eval (tm_proj1 t) (t' #1)
  | E_Proj2 : forall t t', eval t t' -> eval (tm_proj2 t) (t' #2)
  | E_Pair1 : forall t1 t2 t1' t2', eval t1 t1' -> eval (tm_pair t1 t2) (tm_pair t1' t2')
  | E_Pair2 : forall t1 t2 t1' t2', value t1 -> eval (tm_pair t1 t2) (tm_pair t1' t2')

Inductive typing : context -> tm -> ty -> Prop :=
  ...
  | T_Pair : forall Gamma t1 t2 T1 T2, Gamma |- t1 ~ T1 -> Gamma |- t2 ~ T2 -> Gamma |- [[t1,t2]] ~ [[T1,T2]]
  | T_Proj1 : forall Gamma t T1 T2, Gamma |- t ~ [[T1,T2]] -> Gamma |- t #1 ~ T1
  | T_Proj2 : forall Gamma t T1 T2,
\( \Gamma \vdash t \sim [T_1,T_2] \)
\( \rightarrow \Gamma \vdash t \#2 \sim T_2 \)

Inductive subtyping : \( ty \rightarrow ty \rightarrow Prop := \)

...  
| S_Prod : forall S1 S2 T1 T2,  
  S1 <: T1  
  \rightarrow S2 <: T2  
  \rightarrow [[S1,S2]] <: [[T1,T2]]  

14. The declarative subtyping relation $S <: T$ defined on page 18 also cannot be translated “clause for clause” into an efficient recursive function that, given $S$ and $T$, decides whether $S <: T$. Briefly explain why not.

Answer: The most significant problem is the $S_{\text{Trans}}$ rule: Not only does it overlap all of the other rules, but its premises involve a metavariable ($U$) that does not appear in the conclusion: A naive translation would have to somehow iterate over all possible values of $U$, trying the two recursive calls for each one in turn and backtracking if either failed. Since there are infinitely many possible $U$s to try, this process could never succeed in detecting when some type $S$ was not a subtype of some other type $T$. 

Algorithmic Subtyping
Featherweight Java

There will be questions on the exam involving FJ. They will not demand familiarity with the proofs of FJ’s properties, but make sure you understand the properties themselves (the statements of progress and preservation, in particular) and that you understand what the language is and have a basic understanding of how its formal definition works.

The definition of Featherweight Java is summarized on page 22 at the end.

15. Inductive E : Set :=
   | ec_hole : E
   | ec_field : E -> fieldName -> E
   | ec_invk_recv : E -> methodName -> list tm -> E
   | ec_invk_arg : tm -> methodName -> list tm -> E -> list tm -> E
   | ec_new : className -> list tm -> E -> list tm -> E
   | ec_cast : className -> E -> E.

Fixpoint E_subst (e: E) (t: tm) {struct e} : tm :=
match e with
| ec_hole => t
| ec_field c f => tm_field (E_subst c t) f
| ec_invk_recv c m l => tm_invoke (E_subst c t) m l
| ec_invk_arg v m vl c tl => tm_invoke v m (vl ++ [(E_subst c t)] ++ tl)
| ec_new C vl c tl => tm_new C (vl ++ [(E_subst c t)] ++ tl)
| ec_cast C c => tm_cast C (E_subst c t)
end.

Theorem progress : forall CT Gamma t C, CT >> Gamma |- t ~ C
=> (value t)
\/ (exists t', eval t t')
\/ (exists e:E, exists D:className, exists vl:list tm,
 (t = E_subst e (tm_cast C (tm_new D vl)))
\/ (value_list vl)
\/ (~ subtyping CT D C)).

Explain, in English, (1) why the ordinary formulation of progress is incorrect for FJ and (2) why this presentation of the progress theorem tells us something useful.

Answer: The ordinary formulation of progress is false for FJ: There are well-typed programs that are stuck. This theorem tells us the next best thing — that the only way for an FJ program to get stuck is for a cast to fail at runtime.
16. Recall the three typing rules for casts in FJ:

| T_UCast : forall CT Gamma t0 C D, 
  CT >> Gamma |- t0 ~ D 
  -> subtyping CT D C 
  -> CT >> Gamma |- (tm_cast C t0) ~ C |

| T_DCast : forall CT Gamma t0 C D, 
  CT >> Gamma |- t0 ~ D 
  -> subtyping CT C D 
  -> C<>D 
  -> CT >> Gamma |- (tm_cast C t0) ~ C |

| T_SCast : forall CT Gamma t0 C D, 
  CT >> Gamma |- t0 ~ D 
  -> ~ (subtyping CT C D) 
  -> ~ (subtyping CT D C) 
  -> CT >> Gamma |- (tm_cast C t0) ~ C |

Why are there three rules instead of just one? Explain briefly.

Answer: The T_UCast and T_DCast rules are presented separately because full Java only allows casts between related types — i.e., you can cast up or down, but not “across.”

The T_SCast rule, which does allow “across casts,” is needed in FJ because it is possible for a program involving an upcast and a downcast to evaluate to a program involving an “across cast.” To keep the preservation property, we need to allow such casts in the typing relation even though they are sure to fail at runtime. Treating this possibility with a third separate rule (rather than combining all three together) permits us to say that this rule should not be needed when we’re typechecking “original programs,” but is used only for those programs that arise after one or more steps of evaluation.
For reference: Boolean and arithmetic expressions

Inductive tm : Set :=
  | tm_true : tm
  | tm_false : tm
  | tm_if : tm -> tm -> tm -> tm
  | tm_zero : tm
  | tm_succ : tm -> tm
  | tm_pred : tm -> tm
  | tm_iszero : tm -> tm.

Inductive bvalue : tm -> Prop :=
  | bv_true : bvalue tm_true
  | bv_false : bvalue tm_false.

Inductive nvalue : tm -> Prop :=
  | nv_zero : nvalue tm_zero
  | nv_succ : forall t, nvalue t -> nvalue (tm_succ t).

Definition value (t:tm) := bvalue t / nvalue t.

Inductive eval : tm -> tm -> Prop :=
  | E_IfTrue : forall t1 t2, eval (tm_if tm_true t1 t2) t1
  | E_IfFalse : forall t1 t2, eval (tm_if tm_false t1 t2) t2
  | E_If : forall t1 t1' t2 t3, eval t1 t1' -> eval (tm_if t1 t2 t3) (tm_if t1' t2 t3)
  | E_Succ : forall t1 t1', eval t1 t1' -> eval (tm_succ t1) (tm_succ t1')
  | E_PredZero :
    eval (tm_pred tm_zero) tm_zero
  | E_PredSucc : forall t1, nvalue t1 -> eval (tm_pred (tm_succ t1)) t1
  | E_Pred : forall t1 t1', eval t1 t1' -> eval (tm_pred t1) (tm_pred t1')
  | E_IszeroZero :
    eval (tm_iszero tm_zero) tm_true
  | E_IszeroSucc : forall t1,
nvalue t1
-> eval (tm_iszero (tm_succ t1))
  tm_false
| E_Iszero : forall t1 t1',
  eval t1 t1'
-> eval (tm_iszero t1)
  (tm_iszero t1').

Inductive ty : Set :=
| ty_bool : ty
| ty_nat : ty.

Inductive has_type : tm -> ty -> Prop :=
| T_True :
  has_type tm_true ty_bool
| T_False :
  has_type tm_false ty_bool
| T_If : forall t1 t2 t3 T,
  has_type t1 ty_bool
-> has_type t2 T
-> has_type t3 T
-> has_type (tm_if t1 t2 t3) T
| T_Zero :
  has_type tm_zero ty_nat
| T_Succ : forall t1,
  has_type t1 ty_nat
-> has_type (tm_succ t1) ty_nat
| T_Pred : forall t1,
  has_type t1 ty_nat
-> has_type (tm_pred t1) ty_nat
| T_Iszero : forall t1,
  has_type t1 ty_nat
-> has_type (tm_iszero t1) ty_bool.
For reference: Untyped lambda-calculus

Definition name := nat.

Inductive tm : Set :=
| tm_const : name -> tm
| tm_var : name -> tm
| tm_app : tm -> tm -> tm
| tm_abs : name -> tm -> tm.

Notation "' n" := (tm_const n) (at level 19).
Notation "! n" := (tm_var n) (at level 19).
Notation "\ x , t" := (tm_abs x t) (at level 21).
Notation "r @ s" := (tm_app r s) (at level 20).

Fixpoint only_constants (t:tm) {struct t} : yesno :=
match t with
| tm_const _ => yes
| tm_app t1 t2 => both_yes (only_constants t1) (only_constants t2)
| _ => no
end.

Inductive value : tm -> Prop :=
| v_const : forall t, only_constants t = yes -> value t
| v_abs : forall x t, value (\x, t).

Fixpoint subst (x:name) (s:tm) (t:tm) {struct t} : tm :=
match t with
| 'c => 'c
| !y => if eqname x y then s else t
| \y, t1 => if eqname x y then t else (\y, subst x s t1)
| t1 @ t2 => (subst x s t1) @ (subst x s t2)
end.

Inductive eval : tm -> tm -> Prop :=
| E_AppAbs : forall x t12 v2, value v2 -> eval ((\x, t12) @ v2) ({x |-> v2} t12)
| E_App1 : forall t1 t1' t2, eval t1 t1' -> eval (t1 @ t2) (t1' @ t2)
| E_App2 : forall v1 t2 t2', value v1 -> eval t2 t2' -> eval (v1 @ t2) (v1 @ t2').
Notation tru := (\t, \f, t).
Notation fls := (\t, \f, f).

Notation bnot := (\b, b @ fls @ tru).
Notation and := (\b, \c, b @ c @ fls).
Notation or := (\b, \c, b @ tru @ c).
Notation test := (\b, \t, \f, b @ t @ f @ (\x,x)).

Notation pair := (\f, \s, (\b, b @ f @ s)).
Notation fst := (\p, p @ tru).
Notation snd := (\p, p @ fls).

Notation c_zero := (\s, \z, z).
Notation c_one := (\s, \z, s @ z).
Notation c_two := (\s, \z, s @ (s @ z)).
Notation c_three := (\s, \z, s @ (s @ (s @ z))).
Notation scc := (\n, \s, \z, s @ (n @ s @ z)).
Notation pls := (\m, \n, \s, \z, m @ s @ (n @ s @ z)).
Notation tms := (\m, \n, m @ (pls @ n) @ c_zero).
Notation iszro := (\m, m @ (\x, fls) @ tru).
Notation zz := (pair @ c_zero @ c_zero).
Notation ss := (\p, pair @ (snd @ p) @ (pls @ c_one @ (snd @ p))).
Notation prd := (\m, fst @ (m @ ss @ zz)).

Notation omega := ((\x, x @ x) @ (\x, x @ x)).
Notation poisonpill := (\y, omega).

Notation Z := (\f,
               (\y, (\x, f @ (\y, x @ x @ y)) @ (\x, f @ (\y, x @ x @ y)) @ y)).
Notation f_fact := (\f,
                  \n,
                  test
                  @ (iszro @ n)
                  @ (\z, c_one)
                  @ (\z, tms @ n @ (f @ (prd @ n))).
Notation fact := (Z @ f_fact).
For reference: Simply typed lambda-calculus

Inductive ty : Set :=
| ty_base : nat -> ty
| ty_arrow : ty -> ty -> ty.

Notation A := (ty_base one).
Notation B := (ty_base two).
Notation C := (ty_base three).
Notation " S --> T " := (ty_arrow S T) (at level 20, right associativity).

Inductive tm : Set :=
| tm_var : nat -> tm
| tm_app : tm -> tm -> tm
| tm_abs : nat -> ty -> tm -> tm.

Notation " ! n " := (tm_var n) (at level 19).
Notation " \ x ~ T , t " := (tm_abs x T t) (at level 21).
Notation " r @ s " := (tm_app r s) (at level 20).

Fixpoint subst (x:nat) (s:tm) (t:tm) {struct t} : tm :=
match t with
| !y => if eqnat x y then s else t
| \y ~ T, t1 => if eqnat x y then t else (\y ~ T, subst x s t1)
| t1 @ t2 => (subst x s t1) @ (subst x s t2)
end.

Notation "{ x |-> s } t" := (subst x s t) (at level 17).

Inductive value : tm -> Prop :=
| v_abs : forall x T t,
  value (\x ~ T, t).

Inductive eval : tm -> tm -> Prop :=
| E_AppAbs : forall x T t12 v2,
  value v2
  -> eval ((\x ~ T, t12) @ v2) ({x |-> v2} t12)
| E_App1 : forall t1 t1' t2,
  eval t1 t1'
  -> eval (t1 @ t2) (t1' @ t2)
| E_App2 : forall v1 t2 t2',
  value v1
  -> eval t2 t2'
  -> eval (v1 @ t2) (v1 @ t2').
Notation context := (alist ty).

Definition empty : context := nil _.

Reserved Notation "Gamma |- t ~ T" (at level 69).

Inductive typing : context -> tm -> ty -> Prop :=
  | T_Var : forall Gamma x T,
       binds _ x T Gamma ->
       Gamma |- !x ~ T
  | T_Abs : forall Gamma x T1 T2 t,
       (x,T1) :: Gamma |- t ~ T2
       -> Gamma |- (\x ~ T1, t) ~ T1-->T2
  | T_App : forall S T Gamma t1 t2,
       Gamma |- t1 ~ S-->T
       -> Gamma |- t2 ~ S
       -> Gamma |- t1@t2 ~ T

where "Gamma |- t ~ T" := (typing Gamma t T).
For reference: Simply Typed Lambda-Calculus with Records and Subtyping

Inductive ty : Set :=
| ty_top       : ty
| ty_base      : nat -> ty
| ty_arrow     : ty -> ty -> ty
| ty_rcd_nil   : ty
| ty_rcd_cons : nat -> ty -> ty -> ty.

Inductive tm : Set :=
| tm_var       : nat -> tm
| tm_app       : tm -> tm -> tm
| tm_abs       : nat -> ty -> tm -> tm
| tm_rcd_nil   : tm
| tm_rcd_cons : nat -> tm -> tm -> tm
| tm_proj      : tm -> nat -> tm.

Notation A := (ty_base one).
Notation B := (ty_base two).
Notation C := (ty_base three).
Notation Top := ty_top.
Notation "S --> T" := (ty_arrow S T) (at level 20, right associativity).
Notation "[[ ]]" := (ty_rcd_nil).
Notation "[[ l1 ~ T1 ; T2 ]]" := (ty_rcd_cons l1 T1 T2).

Notation "$ n" := (tm_var n) (at level 39).
Notation "x ~ T, t" := (tm_abs x T t) (at level 42).
Notation "$ s" := (tm_app r s) (at level 40, left associativity).
Notation "r # s" := (tm_proj r s) (at level 41).
Notation "[[ ]]" := (tm_rcd_nil).
Notation "[[ l1 == t1 ; t2 ]]" := (tm_rcd_cons l1 t1 t2).

Fixpoint subst (x:nat) (s:tm) (t:tm) {struct t} : tm :=
match t with
| !y => if eqnat x y then s else t
| \y~T, t1 => if eqnat x y then \y~T, {x |-> s}t1
| t1 @ t2 => ({x |-> s}t1) @ ({x |-> s}t2)
| [] => []
| [l..] => [l..]
| [l=t; s, t2] => [l=(x |-> s)t1; {x |-> s}t2]
| t # k => ({x |-> s}t) # k
end

where 
"{ x |-> s } t" := (subst x s t).
Inductive value : tm -> Prop :=
  | v_abs : forall x T t,  
    value (∧x:T, t)  
  | v_rcd_nil :  
    value [[]]  
  | v_rcd_cons : forall l t1 t2,  
    value t1  
    -> value t2  
    -> value [[ l==t1; t2]].

Inductive eval : tm -> tm -> Prop :=
  | E_AppAbs : forall x T t12 v2,  
    value v2  
    -> eval ((∧x:T, t12) @ v2) ({x |-> v2} t12)  
  | E_App1 : forall t1 t1' t2,  
    eval t1 t1'  
    -> eval (t1 @ t2) (t1' @ t2)  
  | E_App2 : forall v1 t2 t2',  
    value v1  
    -> eval t2 t2'  
    -> eval (v1 @ t2) (v1 @ t2')  
  | E_Rcdcons1 : forall k t1 t1' t2,  
    eval t1 t1'  
    -> eval [[k==t1;t2]] [[k==t1';t2]]  
  | E_Rcdcons2 : forall k t1 t2 t2',  
    value t1  
    -> eval t2 t2'  
    -> eval [[k==t1;t2]] [[k==t1;t2']]  
  | E_ProjRcdcons1 : forall k t1 t2,  
    value t1  
    -> value t2  
    -> eval ([[k==t1;t2]] # k) t1  
  | E_ProjRcdcons2 : forall k k' t1 t2,  
    value t1  
    -> value t2  
    -> k <> k'  
    -> eval ([[k'=t1;t2]] # k) (t2 # k)  
  | E_Proj : forall k t t',  
    eval t t'  
    -> eval (t # k) (t' # k).

Inductive doesn't_bind (k:nat) : ty -> Prop :=
  | db_nil :
    doesn't_bind k [[]]  
  | db_cons : forall k' T1 T2,  
    k <> k'  
    -> doesn't_bind k T2  
    -> doesn't_bind k [[[k'-T1;T2]]].

Inductive record_type : ty -> Prop :=
  | rt_nil :
    record_type [[]]
Inductive well_formed : ty -> Prop :=
| wf_top : well_formed Top
| wf_base : forall n,
    well_formed (ty_base n)
| wf_arrow : forall T1 T2,
    well_formed T1
    -> well_formed T2
    -> well_formed (T1-->T2)
| wf_rcdnil :
    well_formed []
| wf_rcdcons : forall k T1 T2,
    well_formed T1
    -> well_formed T2
    -> record_type T2
    -> doesn’t bind k T2
    -> well_formed [[k~T1;T2]].

Inductive subtyping : ty -> ty -> Prop :=
| S_Refl : forall T,
    well_formed T
    -> T <: T
| S_Trans : forall S U T,
    S <: U
    -> U <: T
    -> S <: T
| S_Top : forall S,
    well_formed S
    -> S <: Top
| S_Arrow : forall S1 S2 T1 T2,
    T1 <: S1
    -> S2 <: T2
    -> S1-->S2 <: T1-->T2
| S_Rcdwidth : forall k T1 T2,
    well_formed [[k~T1;T2]]
    -> [[k~T1;T2]] <: [[[]]]
| S_Rcddepth : forall k S1 S2 T1 T2,
    S1 <: T1
    -> S2 <: T2
    -> well_formed [[k~S1;S2]]
    -> well_formed [[k~T1;T2]]
    -> [[k~S1;S2]] <: [[k~T1;T2]]
| S_Rcdperm : forall k1 k2 S1 S2 S3,
    well_formed [[k1~S1; [[k2~S2; S3]]]]
    -> k1 <> k2
    -> [[k1~S1; [[k2~S2; S3]]]] <: [[k2~S2; [[k1~S1; S3]]]]
where "S <: T" := (subtyping S T).
Notation context := (alist ty).

Definition empty : context := nil _.

Fixpoint ty_rcd_lookup (k:nat) (t:ty) {struct t} : option ty :=
  match t with
  | ty_rcd_cons k' T' t' =>
    if eqnat k k' then Some _ T' else ty_rcd_lookup k t'
  | _ => None _
  end.

Definition ty_rcd_binds (k:nat) (Tk:ty) (T:ty) :=
  ty_rcd_lookup k T = Some _ Tk.

Inductive typing : context -> tm -> ty -> Prop :=
  T_Var : forall Gamma x T,
    binds _ x T Gamma
    -> well_formed T
    -> Gamma |- (!x) ~ T
  T_Abs : forall Gamma x T1 T2 t,
    well_formed T1
    -> [(x,T1)] ++ Gamma |- t ~ T2
    -> Gamma |- (\x~T1, t) ~ T1-->T2
  T_App : forall S T Gamma t1 t2,
    Gamma |- t1 ~ (S-->T)
    -> Gamma |- t2 ~ S
    -> Gamma |- (t1 @ t2) ~ T
  T_Rcdnil : forall Gamma,
    Gamma |- [||] ~ [||]
  T_Rcdcons : forall Gamma k t1 t2 T1 T2,
    Gamma |- t1 ~ T1
    -> Gamma |- t2 ~ T2
    -> well_formed [[k~T1;T2]]
    -> Gamma |- [[k=t1;t2]] ~ [[k~T1;T2]]
  T_Proj : forall Gamma k Tk t T,
    Gamma |- t ~ T
    -> ty_rcd_binds k Tk T
    -> Gamma |- t # k ~ Tk
  T_Sub : forall Gamma t S T,
    Gamma |- t ~ S
    -> S <: T
    -> Gamma |- t ~ T

where "Gamma |- t ~ T" := (typing Gamma t T).
For reference: Featherweight Java

Definition varName : Set := nat.
Definition fieldName : Set := nat.
Definition methodName : Set := nat.
Definition className : Set := nat.

Inductive tm : Set :=
| tm_var : varName -> tm (* variable *)
| tm_field : tm -> fieldName -> tm (* field access *)
| tm_invoke : tm -> methodName -> list tm -> tm (* method invocation *)
| tm_new : className -> list tm -> tm (* object creation *)
| tm_cast : className -> tm -> tm. (* cast *)

Definition this := zero.

Inductive value : tm -> Prop :=
| v_new : forall C vl, value_list vl
  -> value (tm_new C vl)
with value_list : list tm -> Prop :=
| v_nil : value_list (nil _)
| v_cons : forall v l, value v
  -> value_list l
  -> value_list (v :: l).

Inductive K : Set :=
| constructor :
  className -> list (varName * className)
  -> list varName -> list varName -> K.

Inductive M : Set :=
| method :
  className -> methodName
  -> list (varName * className) -> tm -> M.

Inductive CL : Set :=
| class :
  className -> className
  -> list (fieldName * className) -> K -> list M -> CL.

Definition CT : Set := alist CL.

Definition Object := zero.

Inductive subtyping : CT -> className -> className -> Prop :=
| S_Refl : forall CT C,
  subtyping CT C C
| S_Trans : forall CT C D E,
  subtyping CT C D
-> subtyping CT D E
> subtyping CT C E
| S_Ext : forall CT C D Cf K M,
  lookup _ C CT = Some _ (class C D Cf K M)
-> subtyping CT C D.

(* Field lookup *)
Inductive fields : CT -> className -> list (fieldName * className) -> Prop :=
| f_obj : forall CT C,
  C = Object -> fields CT C (nil _)
| f_class : forall CT C D Cf K M' Dg,
  lookup _ C CT = Some _ (class C D Cf K M')
-> fields CT D Dg
-> fields CT C (Dg ++ Cf).

(* Search for a method in a list of method delarations *)
Fixpoint mlookup (m : methodName) (l : list M) {struct l} : option M :=
match l with
| nil => None _
| (method T m' Cx t) :: l' =>
  if eqnat m m' then Some _ (method T m' Cx t) else mlookup m l'
end.

(* Method type lookup *)
Inductive mtype : CT -> methodName -> className -> list className -> className -> Prop :=
| mt_class : forall CT m C D Cf K M' Cx t B' B,
  lookup _ C CT = Some _ (class C D Cf K M')
-> mlookup m M' = Some _ (method B m Cx t)
-> B' = map _ _ (fun p => match p with (f,s) => s end) Cx
-> mtype CT m C B' B
| mt_super : forall CT m C D Cf K M' B' B,
  lookup _ C CT = Some _ (class C D Cf K M')
-> mlookup m M' = None _
-> mtype CT m D B' B
-> mtype CT m C B' B.

(* Method body lookup *)
Inductive mbody : CT -> methodName -> className -> list varName -> tm -> Prop :=
| mb_class : forall CT m C D Cf K M' Cx t x B,
  lookup _ C CT = Some _ (class C D Cf K M')
-> mlookup m M' = Some _ (method B m Cx t)
-> x = map _ _ (fun p => match p with (f,s) => f end) Cx
-> mbody CT m C x t
| mb_super : forall CT m C D Cf K M' x t,
  lookup _ C CT = Some _ (class C D Cf K M')
-> mlookup m M' = None _
-> mbody CT m D x t
-> mbody CT m C x t.

Inductive method_not_defined_in_class : CT -> methodName -> className -> Prop :=
| mndic_obj : forall CT m,
  method_not_defined_in_class CT m Object
| mndic_class : forall CT m C D Cf K M',
  lookup _ C CT = Some _ (class C D Cf K M')
-> mlookup m M' = None _
-> method_not_defined_in_class CT m D
-> method_not_defined_in_class CT m C.

(* Valid method overriding *)
Inductive override : CT -> methodName -> className -> list className -> className -> Prop :=
| m_notboundinsuper : forall CT m D C' C0,
  method_not_defined_in_class CT m D
-> override CT m D C' C0
| m_over : forall CT m D C' C0 D' D0,
  mtype CT m D D' D0
-> C' = D'
-> C0=D0
-> override CT m D C' C0.

Fixpoint subst (x: list varName) (u: list tm)
(C:className) (v:list tm)
(t:tm) {struct t} : tm :=
match t with
| tm_var this => tm_new C v
| tm_var y =>
  match lookup _ y (combine _ _ x u) with
  | Some u1 => u1
  | None => t
  end
| tm_field t1 f =>
  tm_field (subst x u C v t1) f
| tm_invoke t1 m l =>
  tm_invoke (subst x u C v t1) m
  ((fix subst_list (x: list varName) (u: list tm)
    (C:className) (v:list tm) (tl: list tm)
    {struct tl} : list tm :=
    match tl with
    | nil => nil _
    | (h::t) => (subst x u C v h) :: (subst_list x u C v t)
    end) x u C v l)
| tm_new D l =>
  tm_new D ((fix subst_list (x: list varName) (u: list tm)
    (C:className) (v:list tm) (tl: list tm)
    {struct tl} : list tm :=
    match tl with
    | nil => nil _
    | (h::t) => (subst x u C v h) :: (subst_list x u C v t)
    end) x u C v l)
| tm_cast D t1 => tm_cast D (subst x u C v t1)
end.

Inductive eval : CT -> tm -> tm -> Prop :=
| E_ProjNew : forall CT C v fj vj Cf,
  value_list v
-> fields CT C Cf
-> (lookup _ fj
   (combine _ _ (map _ _ (fun p => match p with (f,s) => f end) Cf) v))
   = Some _ vj
-> eval CT (tm_field (tm_new C v) fj) (vj)
| E_InvkNew : forall CT C v m u t0 x,
  value_list v
  -> value_list u
  -> mbody CT m C x t0
  -> eval CT (tm_invoke (tm_new C v) m u) (subst x u C v t0)
| E_CastNew : forall CT C D v,
  value_list v
  -> subtyping CT C D
  -> eval CT (tm_cast D (tm_new C v)) (tm_new C v)
| E_Field : forall CT f t t',
  eval CT t t'
  -> eval CT (tm_field t f) (tm_field t' f)
| E_Invk_Recv : forall CT l m t0 t0',
  eval CT t0 t0'
  -> eval CT (tm_invoke t0 m l) (tm_invoke t0' m l)
| E_Invk_Arg : forall CT v0 m v ti ti' t,
  value v0
  -> value_list v
  -> eval CT ti ti'
  -> eval CT (tmInvoke v0 m (v ++ [ti] ++ t))
   (tmInvoke v0 m (v ++ [ti'] ++ t))
| E_New_Arg : forall CT C v ti ti' t,
  value_list v
  -> eval CT ti ti'
  -> eval CT (tmNew C v ++ [ti] ++ t) (tmNew C v ++ [ti'] ++ t))
| E_Cast : forall CT C t t',
  eval CT t t'
  -> eval CT (tm_cast C t) (tm_cast C t').

Notation context := (alist className).

Definition empty : context := nil _.

Inductive typing : CT -> context -> tm -> className -> Prop :=
| T_Var : forall CT Gamma x C,
  binds _ x C Gamma
  -> CT >> Gamma |- (tm_var x) ~ C
| T_Field : forall CT Gamma t0 fi Ci C0 Cf,
  CT >> Gamma |- t0 ~ C0
  -> fields CT C0 Cf
  -> (lookup _ fi Cf) = Some _ Ci
  -> CT >> Gamma |- (tm_field t0 fi) ~ Ci
| T_Invk : forall CT Gamma t0 m tl C C0 Dl,
  CT >> Gamma |- t0 ~ C0
  -> mtype CT m C0 Dl C
  -> typing_list CT Gamma tl Dl
  -> CT >> Gamma |- (tm_invoke t0 m tl) ~ C
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| T_New : forall CT Gamma tl C Df,
  fields CT C Df
  -> typing_list CT Gamma tl
    (map _ _ (fun p => match p with (f,s) => s end) Df)
  -> CT >> Gamma |- (tm_new C tl) ~ C
| T_UCast : forall CT Gamma t0 C D,
  CT >> Gamma |- t0 ~ D
  -> subtyping CT D C
  -> CT >> Gamma |- (tm_cast C t0) ~ C
| T_DCast : forall CT Gamma t0 C D,
  CT >> Gamma |- t0 ~ D
  -> subtyping CT D C
  -> C<>D
  -> CT >> Gamma |- (tm_cast C t0) ~ C
| T_SCast : forall CT Gamma t0 C D,
  CT >> Gamma |- t0 ~ D
  -> ~ (subtyping CT C D)
  -> ~ (subtyping CT D C)
  -> CT >> Gamma |- (tm_cast C t0) ~ C

with typing_list : CT -> context -> list tm -> list className -> Prop :=
| TL_nil : forall CT Gamma,
  typing_list CT Gamma (nil _) (nil _)
| TL_cons : forall CT Gamma t tl C Cl T,
  typing CT Gamma t T
  -> subtyping CT T C
  -> typing_list CT Gamma tl Cl
  -> typing_list CT Gamma (t::tl) (C::Cl)

where "CT >> Gamma |- t ~ T" := (typing CT Gamma t T).

(* Method typing *)
Inductive mtyping : CT -> className -> methodName
  -> list (varName * className) -> tm ->className -> Prop :=
| m_ok : forall CT C0 m Cx t0 C D Cl Df K Ml E0,
  CT >> (this,C) :: Cx |- t0 ~ E0
  -> subtyping CT E0 C0
  -> lookup _ C CT = Some _ (class C D Cf K Ml)
  -> override CT m D Cl C0
  -> mtyping CT C0 m Cx t0 C.
Hint Constructors mtyping.

Inductive mlist_typing : CT -> list M -> className -> Prop :=
| m_ok_nil : forall CT C,
  mlist_typing CT (nil _) C
| m_ok_cons : forall CT M C Ml C0 m Cx t0,
  M = method C0 m Cx t0
  -> mtyping CT C0 m Cx t0 C
  -> mlist_typing CT (M :: Ml) C.
Hint Constructors mlist_typing.

(* Class typing *)
Inductive ctyping : CT -> className -> className
   -> list (fieldName * className) -> K -> list M -> Prop :=
| c_ok : forall CT C D Cf K Ml Dg,
   K = constructor C (Dg ++ Cf)
   (map _ _ (fun p => match p with (f,s) => f end) Dg)
   (map _ _ (fun p => match p with (f,s) => f end) Cf)
   -> fields CT D Dg
   -> mlist_typing CT Ml C
   -> ctyping CT C D Cf K Ml.

Definition wf_class_table (ct : CT) : Prop :=
forall C D Cf K M',
   lookup _ C ct = Some _ (class C D Cf K M')
   -> ctyping ct C D Cf K M'.