

CIS 500 — Software Foundations

Final Exam

Answer key

December 20, 2004

True/False questions

For each of the following statements, circle T if the sentence is true or F otherwise.

1. (10 points)

- (a) T F The untyped lambda calculus can encode any computable function on the natural numbers.
- (b) T F The simply-typed lambda calculus (not including fix) can encode any computable function on the natural numbers.
- (c) T F The simply-typed lambda calculus (not including fix) with references can encode any computable function on the natural numbers.
- (d) T F Featherweight Java can encode any computable function on the natural numbers.
- (e) T F If the preservation theorem is true for a language, removing a typing rule may cause it to become untrue.
- (f) T F If the progress theorem is true for a language, removing a typing rule may cause it to become untrue.
- (g) T F The only way to prove that the preservation theorem holds for a language is by induction on the structure of the typing derivation.
- (h) T F For a given syntax and operational semantics, it is always possible to devise a set of typing rules such that the preservation and progress theorems hold.
- (i) T F Featherweight Java has the uniqueness of types property.
- (j) T F The evaluation relation must be deterministic (i.e. for any term there should be only way to evaluate it) to prove the progress theorem.

Grading scheme: Binary. 1 pt each.

Untyped lambda-calculus

The following questions refer to the untyped lambda-calculus. The syntax and evaluation rules for this system are given on page 1 of the companion handout.

2. (12 points)

Consider the following definition of the multi-step evaluation relation, $t \longrightarrow^* t'$:

$$t \longrightarrow^* t \quad \text{(EV-DONE)}$$

$$\frac{t \longrightarrow t' \quad t' \longrightarrow^* t''}{t \longrightarrow^* t''} \quad \text{(EV-STEP)}$$

(a) Is the multi-step evaluation relation a partial function? In other words, for any t does there exist at most one t' such that $t \longrightarrow^* t'$? If yes, briefly say why. If no, give a counterexample.

Answer: No, because $(\lambda x.x)(\lambda y.y) \longrightarrow^ (\lambda x.x)$ and $(\lambda x.x)(\lambda y.y) \longrightarrow^* (\lambda x.x)(\lambda y.y)$*

Grading scheme: 3 points. 1 point partial credit for answering no, but providing a wrong counterexample.

(b) For any t , does there exist at least one t' such that $t \longrightarrow^* t'$? If yes, briefly say why. If no, give a counterexample.

Answer: Yes, because the relation is reflexive. Grading scheme: 3 points. 1 point partial credit for answering yes, but providing the wrong reason.

(c) Show that the multi-step evaluation relation is transitive. In other words, prove that if $t \longrightarrow^* t'$ and $t' \longrightarrow^* t''$ then $t \longrightarrow^* t''$. Be explicit about each step of the proof, but do not include any irrelevant information.

Answer: Proof is by induction on the structure of the derivation $t \longrightarrow^ t'$.*

- *Case EV-DONE. In this case, $t=t'$. As $t' \longrightarrow^* t''$ by assumption, then $t \longrightarrow^* t''$.*
- *Case EV-STEP. In this case $t \longrightarrow t_1$ and $t_1 \longrightarrow^* t'$. By induction $t_1 \longrightarrow^* t''$. By EV-STEP, $t \longrightarrow^* t''$.*

Grading scheme: 6 points total.

3. (10 points)

The following is yet another encoding of numbers in the untyped lambda calculus.

$$s_0 = \lambda z. \lambda s. z$$

$$s_1 = \lambda z. \lambda s. s s_0$$

$$s_2 = \lambda z. \lambda s. s s_1$$

$$s_3 = \lambda z. \lambda s. s s_2$$

In general, $s_{n+1} = \lambda z. \lambda s. s s_n$.

Below, circle the correct implementation of the following functions. Some of these implementations use the following definitions from TAPL chapter 5:

$$\text{pair} = \lambda f. \lambda s. \lambda b. b f s$$

$$\text{fst} = \lambda p. p (\lambda x. \lambda y. x)$$

$$\text{snd} = \lambda p. p (\lambda x. \lambda y. y)$$

$$\text{fix} = \lambda f. (\lambda x. f (\lambda y. x y y)) (\lambda x. f (\lambda y. x y y))$$

(a) The successor function, where $\text{sscc } s_n = s_{n+1}$.

- i. $\lambda x. \lambda z. \lambda s. x s z$
- ii. $\lambda x. \lambda z. \lambda s. x z s$
- iii. $\lambda x. \lambda z. \lambda s. s x$
- iv. $\lambda x. \lambda z. \lambda s. s (x z s)$
- v. $\lambda x. \lambda z. \lambda s. s x (x z s)$

Answer: iii.

(b) The predecessor function, where $\text{sprd } s_0 = s_0$ and $\text{sprd } s_{n+1} = s_n$.

- i. $\lambda x. x s_0 (\lambda y. y)$
- ii. $\lambda x. x (\lambda y. y) (\lambda z. z)$
- iii. $\lambda x. \text{snd } (x (\text{pair } s_0 s_0)) (\lambda p. \text{pair } (\text{snd } p) (\text{sscc } (\text{snd } p)))$
- iv. $\lambda x. \text{fst } (\lambda p. \text{pair } (\text{snd } p) (\text{sscc } (\text{snd } p))) (x (\text{pair } s_0 s_0))$
- v. $\lambda x. \text{fst } (x (\text{pair } s_0 s_0)) (\lambda p. \text{pair } (\text{snd } p) (\text{sscc } (\text{snd } p)))$

Answer: i.

(c) The addition function, where $\text{splus } s_m s_n = s_{n+m}$.

- i. $\lambda m. \lambda n. m n (\lambda z. z)$
- ii. $\lambda m. \lambda n. \lambda z. \lambda s. m (n z s) s$
- iii. $\lambda m. \lambda n. n m (\lambda x. \text{sscc})$
- iv. $\text{fix } (\lambda \text{plus}. \lambda m. \lambda n. n m (\text{plus } (\text{sscc } m)))$
- v. $\lambda m. \lambda n. \text{fix } (\lambda \text{plus}. n m (\text{sscc } (\lambda n. \text{plus } m (\text{sprd } n))))$

Answer: iv.

Grading scheme: 3pts for a and b. 4 points for c.

4. (12 points) Circle the normal forms of the following untyped lambda calculus terms. If a term has no normal form, circle *NOTHING*. Recall that the normal form of a term t is some term t' such that $t \rightarrow^* t'$ and $t' \not\rightarrow$.

- (a) $(\lambda x. \lambda y. x y) (\lambda z. \lambda w. w)$
- i. $\lambda y. (\lambda z. \lambda w. w) y$
 - ii. $(\lambda x. \lambda y. x y) (\lambda z. \lambda w. w)$
 - iii. $\lambda x. x (\lambda z. \lambda w. w)$
 - iv. $\lambda y. \lambda w. w$
 - v. NOTHING

Answer: i.

- (b) $(\lambda x. \lambda y. x) (\lambda x. y)$
- i. $(\lambda x. \lambda y. x) (\lambda x. y)$
 - ii. $(\lambda x. \lambda y. (\lambda x. y))$
 - iii. $(\lambda y. \lambda x. y)$
 - iv. $(\lambda w. \lambda x. y)$
 - v. NOTHING

Answer: iv.

- (c) $(\lambda f. (\lambda x. f (\lambda y. x x y)) (\lambda x. f (\lambda y. x x y))) (\lambda g. g) (\lambda h. h)$
- i. $(\lambda f. (\lambda x. f (\lambda y. x x y)) (\lambda x. f (\lambda y. x x y))) (\lambda g. g)$
 - ii. $\lambda h. h$
 - iii. $(\lambda x. (\lambda g. g) (\lambda y. x x y)) (\lambda x. (\lambda g. g) (\lambda y. x x y))$
 - iv. $\lambda x. (\lambda g. g) (\lambda y. x x y)$
 - v. NOTHING

Answer: v.

- (d) $(\lambda f. (\lambda x. f (\lambda y. x x y)) (\lambda x. f (\lambda y. x x y))) (\lambda g. \lambda y. y) (\lambda h. h)$
- i. $(\lambda f. (\lambda x. f (\lambda y. x x y)) (\lambda x. f (\lambda y. x x y))) (\lambda g. \lambda y. y)$
 - ii. $\lambda h. h$
 - iii. $(\lambda x. (\lambda g. \lambda y. y) (\lambda y. x x y)) (\lambda x. (\lambda g. \lambda y. y) (\lambda y. x x y))$
 - iv. $\lambda x. (\lambda g. \lambda y. y) (\lambda y. x x y)$
 - v. NOTHING

Answer: ii.

Grading scheme: 3 points each.

Simply typed lambda-calculus

The following questions refer to the simply typed lambda-calculus (with recursion and base type Bool). The syntax, typing, and evaluation rules for this system are given on page 2 of the companion handout.

We can define the *big-step* evaluation relation for the simply typed lambda-calculus with recursion and booleans using the following rules:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 v \Downarrow v \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{(B-VALUE)} \\
 \\
 \frac{t_1 \Downarrow \lambda x:T. t \quad t_2 \Downarrow v_2 \quad [x \mapsto v_2]t \Downarrow v}{t_1 t_2 \Downarrow v} \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{(B-APP)} \\
 \\
 \frac{t_1 \Downarrow \text{true} \quad t_2 \Downarrow v}{\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 \Downarrow v} \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{(B-IFTRUE)} \\
 \\
 \frac{t_1 \Downarrow \text{false} \quad t_3 \Downarrow v}{\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 \Downarrow v} \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{(B-IFFALSE)} \\
 \\
 \frac{t \Downarrow \lambda x:T_1. t_1 \quad [x \mapsto \text{fix } (\lambda x:T_1. t_1)]t_1 \Downarrow v}{\text{fix } t \Downarrow v} \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{(B-FIX)}
 \end{array}$$

Jen Kennings, an eager assistant professor thought that it would be really great if the following proposition were true about these rules:

Proposition: If $\emptyset \vdash t : T$ then there exists a v such that $t \Downarrow v$ and $\emptyset \vdash v : T$.

5. (10 points)

- (a) Unfortunately, this proposition is not true. Write down a counter-example where it fails. (i.e., find some closed, well typed term t such that either there is no v such that $t \Downarrow v$, or there is a such a v , but it doesn't type check with the same type.)

Answer: Any term that doesn't terminate.

Grading scheme: 3 points. 1 point partial credit for any answer mentioning *fix* in any way.

- (b) Not realizing that this proposition is false, professor Kennings started trying to prove it by induction on the typing derivation. However, she made a serious mistake in one of the first three cases, shown below. **Briefly describe her error in one or two sentences.** Note, professor Kennings hasn't yet attempted the cases for T-True, T-False, T-If or T-Fix, so those cases are not shown.

Proposition: If $\emptyset \vdash t : T$ then there exists a v such that $t \Downarrow v$ and $\emptyset \vdash v : T$.

Proof: Proof is induction on the typing derivation $\emptyset \vdash t : T$.

Case T-VAR: $t=x \quad x:T \in \emptyset$

This case is impossible as the context is assumed to be empty.

Case T-ABS: $t=\lambda x:T_1. t_2 \quad T=T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \quad x:T_1 \vdash t_2 : T_2$

This case is simple as $\lambda x:T_1. t_2 \Downarrow \lambda x:T_1. t_2$ by B-VALUE, and $\emptyset \vdash \lambda x:T_1. t_2 : T$ by assumption.

Case T-APP: $t=t_1 t_2 \quad \emptyset \vdash t_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T \quad \emptyset \vdash t_2 : T_1$

By induction, there exists a v_1 such that $t_1 \Downarrow v_1$ and $\emptyset \vdash v_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T$.

Also by induction, there exists a v_2 such that $t_2 \Downarrow v_2$ and $\emptyset \vdash v_2 : T_1$.

By canonical forms, v_1 is $\lambda x:T_1. t_{11}$ and by inversion of the typing relation, $x:T_1 \vdash t_{11} : T$.

By substitution, $\emptyset \vdash [x \mapsto v_2]t_{11} : T$.

By induction, there exists a v such that $[x \mapsto v_2]t_{11} \Downarrow v$ and $\emptyset \vdash v : T$.

Finally, by the evaluation rule B-APP, $t_1 t_2 \Downarrow v$ and we've already shown that $\emptyset \vdash v : T$. □

Note: In her proof attempt above, professor Kennings referred to the following lemmas about the typed lambda-calculus with booleans and recursion. These lemmas are true, but she may or may not have used them correctly.

LEMMA (INVERSION OF THE TYPING RELATION):

- i. If $\Gamma \vdash \lambda x:T_1. t_2 : R$ then $R=T_1 \rightarrow R_2$ for some R_2 with $\Gamma, x:T_1 \vdash t_2 : R_2$.

LEMMA (CANONICAL FORMS): If v is a value of type $T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ then $v=\lambda x:T_1. t_2$.

LEMMA (SUBSTITUTION): If $\Gamma, x:S \vdash t : T$ and $\Gamma \vdash s : S$ then $\Gamma \vdash [x \mapsto s]t : T$.

Answer: In the T-App case, the induction hypothesis does not apply to $\emptyset \vdash [x \mapsto v_2]t_{11} : T$ because it is not a subderivation of the typing derivation.

Grading scheme: 7 points. 2 points partial credit for identifying the T-App case as the culprit. 2 points deducted for insufficiently explicit answers.

Simply typed lambda-calculus with algorithmic subtyping

The following questions refer to the pure simply typed lambda-calculus with algorithmic subtyping (with just Top —no booleans or records). The syntax, typing and evaluation rule this system are given on page 4 of the companion handout.

6. (30 points)

The preservation theorem for the system with algorithmic typing can be stated as:

THEOREM (PRESERVATION): If $\Gamma \vdash t : T$ and $t \longrightarrow t'$ then $\Gamma \vdash t' : S$ where $\vdash S <: T$.

(a) Unlike the system with declarative typing, we **cannot** state the preservation theorem for this system as

If $\Gamma \vdash t : T$ and $t \longrightarrow t'$ then $\Gamma \vdash t' : T$.

This version of the theorem is false. Demonstrate why with a counter-example (i.e. find some term t that steps to some t' that cannot be given the *same* type with the algorithmic typing rules).

Answer: The term $(\lambda x : \text{Top} . x) (\lambda y : \text{Top} . y)$ must be given the type Top . However, it single-steps to $(\lambda y : \text{Top} . y)$ which has type $\text{Top} \rightarrow \text{Top}$ under the algorithmic typing rules.

Grading scheme: 5 points. No deduction for answers that weren't technically in the language (involving booleans or numbers). One point deducted for right idea, but example that doesn't type check.

(b) Complete a precise and detailed proof of the preservation theorem on the next page. This proof is by induction on the **evaluation relation** $t \longrightarrow t'$. The case for E-APP1 has been done for you, but you need to do the cases for E-APP2 and E-APPABS. Note that the system we are considering in this problem, defined on page 4 of the handout, includes just Top and \rightarrow ; your proof need not deal with other type constructors such as records. Do not include any extraneous information (true or false) in your proof. If needed, you may refer [without proof] to the lemmas stated below.

- i. LEMMA (SUBTYPING RELATION INVERSION): If $\vdash S <: T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ then $S = S_1 \rightarrow S_2$ with $\vdash T_1 <: S_1$ and $\vdash S_2 <: T_2$.
- ii. LEMMA (REFLEXIVITY OF SUBTYPING): $\vdash S <: S$.
- iii. LEMMA (TRANSITIVITY OF SUBTYPING): If $\vdash S <: T$ and $\vdash T <: U$ then $\vdash S <: U$.
- iv. LEMMA (TYPING RELATION INVERSION):
 - A. If $\Gamma \vdash t_1 t_2 : T$ then $\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T$ and $\Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_2$ and $\vdash T_2 <: T_1$.
 - B. If $\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : T_1 . t_2 : T$ then $T = T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ and $\Gamma, x : T_1 \vdash t_2 : T_2$.
- v. LEMMA (SUBSTITUTION): If $\Gamma, x : S \vdash t : T$ and $\Gamma \vdash s : S'$ with $\vdash S' <: S$ then $\Gamma \vdash [x \mapsto s]t : T'$ where $\vdash T' <: T$.

THEOREM (PRESERVATION): If $\Gamma \vdash t : T$ and $t \longrightarrow t'$ then $\Gamma \vdash t' : S$ where $\vdash S <: T$.

Proof: By induction on the evaluation relation, $t \longrightarrow t'$.

Case E-APP1: $t = t_1 t_2 \quad t' = t'_1 t_2 \quad t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1$

By inversion of the typing relation, $\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \rightarrow T$ and $\Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_2$ and $\vdash T_2 <: T_{11}$.

By the induction hypothesis, $\Gamma \vdash t'_1 : S$ for some $\vdash S <: T_{11} \rightarrow T$.

By inversion of the subtyping relation, $S = S_1 \rightarrow S_2$ where $\vdash T_{11} <: S_1$ and $\vdash S_2 <: T$.

By the transitivity of subtyping, $\vdash T_2 <: S_1$.

By TA-APP, $\Gamma \vdash t'_1 t_2 : S_2$, where $\vdash S_2 <: T$ as required.

Case E-APP2: $t = v_1 t_2 \quad t' = v_1 t'_2 \quad t_2 \longrightarrow t'_2$

Answer:

By inversion, $\Gamma \vdash v_1 : T_{11} \rightarrow T$ and $\Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_2$ and $\vdash T_2 <: T_{11}$.

By induction, $\Gamma \vdash t'_2 : S$ for some $\vdash S <: T_2$.

By transitivity, $\vdash S <: T_{11}$.

By TA-APP, then $\Gamma \vdash v_1 t'_2 : T$.

By reflexivity of subtyping, $\vdash T <: T$ as required.

Grading scheme: Roughly 3 points per line. In particular, -3 for missing the use of reflexivity in the last line or transitivity in the third line.

Case E-APPABS: $t = (\lambda x : T_{11} . t_{12}) v_2 \quad t' = [x \mapsto v_2] t_{12}$

Answer:

By inversion, $\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : T_{11} . t_{12} : S \rightarrow T$ and $\Gamma \vdash v_2 : T_2$ and $\vdash T_2 <: S$.

By inversion again, $\Gamma, x : T_{11} \vdash t_{12} : T$ and $S \rightarrow T = T_{11} \rightarrow T$. Note that this means that $T_2 <: T_{11}$.

By substitution, $\Gamma \vdash [x \mapsto v_2] t_{12} : T'$ where $\vdash T' <: T$.

Grading scheme: Roughly 3 points per line. -2 for using the first inversion lemma incorrectly, and saying that $\lambda x : T_{11} . t_{12}$ has type $T_{11} \rightarrow T$. We don't know that the type of the argument is T_{11} until we use inversion again.

□

Simply typed lambda-calculus with subtyping, records, and references

The following questions refer to the simply typed lambda-calculus with subtyping, records, and references (and base types Nat , Bool , and Unit). The syntax, typing, and evaluation rules for this system are given on page 5 of the companion handout.

7. (9 points)

- (a) List all syntactically different supertypes of $\{a:\text{Top}, b:\text{Top}\}$. Note: S and T are syntactically different types if they are written differently, even though it may be the case that $S < : T$ and $T < : S$.

Answer: There are six. $\{a:\text{Top}, b:\text{Top}\}$, $\{b:\text{Top}, a:\text{Top}\}$, $\{a:\text{Top}\}$, $\{b:\text{Top}\}$, $\{\}$ and Top .

Grading scheme: 1 point for 1-2 answers, 2 points for 3-4 answers, and 3 points for 5-6 answers.

- (b) Is there an infinite *descending* chain in the subtype relation—that is, an infinite sequence of types S_0, S_1 , etc. such that each S_{i+1} is a subtype of S_i ? Note: Trivial chains don't count—each S_i must be different from all other types in the chain. If so, give an example. If not, describe why.

Answer: Yes, let

$$S_0 = \{ \}$$
$$S_1 = \{ a:\text{Top} \}$$
$$S_2 = \{ a:\text{Top}, b:\text{Top} \}$$

Grading scheme: 3 points. Partial credit for answering yes, but providing an incorrect example.

- (c) Is there an infinite *ascending* chain in the subtype relation? Again, trivial chains don't count—each S_i must be different from all other types in the chain. If so, give an example. If not, describe why.

Answer: Yes, let $T_0 = S_0 \rightarrow \text{Top}$, $T_1 = S_1 \rightarrow \text{Top}$, etc.

Grading scheme: 3 points. Partial credit for answering yes, but providing an incorrect example.

8. (15 points)

What is the minimal (or principal) type of the following expressions in the simply-typed lambda-calculus with subtyping, records and references? If a term does not type check, write NONE.

(a) $\lambda x: (\text{Ref Bool}) \rightarrow \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Nat}. x (\text{ref true})$

Answer: $((\text{Ref Bool}) \rightarrow \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Nat}) \rightarrow \text{Bool} \rightarrow \text{Nat}$

(b) $(\lambda x: \{a: \text{Ref Top}\}. x) \{a = \text{ref } (\lambda y: \text{Top}. y)\}$

Answer: NONE

(c) $(\lambda x: \{a: \text{Nat}\} \rightarrow \text{Top}. x \{a=2\}) (\lambda y: \{a: \text{Top}\}. y.a)$

Answer: Top

(d) $\text{if true then } \lambda x: \text{Ref Top}. \{ y = \{b = !x\}, d = !x \}$
 $\text{else } \lambda x: \text{Ref Top}. \{ y = \{a = 2, b = 3\} \}$

Answer: $(\text{Ref Top}) \rightarrow \{y: \{b: \text{Top}\}\}$

(e) $\text{if true then } \lambda x: \text{Ref Top}. !x$
 $\text{else } \lambda x: \text{Nat}. x$

Answer: Top

Grading scheme: 3 points each. No partial credit for missing parens around the function argument in part (a).

Featherweight Java

The following questions refer to the Featherweight Java language. The syntax, typing, and evaluation rules for this system are given on page 9 of the companion handout.

9. (12 points)

Consider extending Featherweight Java with *functional field update*. Functional field update allows programmers to easily create new objects that differ from existing objects only in the value of a single field.

We formalize this extension by adding one new expression form to the syntax of FJ:

$$t ::= \dots$$

$$t.f \leq t \quad \textit{functional field update}$$

The computation rule for functional field update returns a new object where the value of field f_i has been replaced with the new value v' .

$$\frac{\text{fields}(C) = \overline{C} \overline{f}}{\text{new } C(v_1, \dots, v_n).f_i \leq v' \longrightarrow \text{new } C(v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}, v', v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n)} \quad (\text{E-UPDATE})$$

The two congruence rules specify the order of evaluation.

$$\frac{t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1}{t_1.f \leq t_2 \longrightarrow t'_1.f \leq t_2} \quad (\text{E-UPDATE-RECV})$$

$$\frac{t_2 \longrightarrow t'_2}{v.f \leq t_2 \longrightarrow v.f \leq t'_2} \quad (\text{E-UPDATE-ARG})$$

For example, given the following class table

```
class A extends Object {
  Object x;
  Object y;
  Object z;
}

class B extends Object {
}
```

A possible evaluation sequence is:

```
(new A(new Object(), new Object(), new Object()).y <= new B()).y
→ new A(new Object(), new B(), new Object()).y
→ new B()
```

- (a) Fill in the preconditions of the typing rule for functional field update so that the above example type checks and the preservation and progress theorems of FJ still hold. Furthermore, the type C must be the minimal type for the expression. (You do not need to do any proofs of these properties.)

$$\frac{\text{Answer: } \Gamma \vdash t : C \quad \text{fields}(C) = \bar{C} \bar{F} \quad \Gamma \vdash t_i : T_i \quad T_i <: C_i}{\Gamma \vdash t.f_i \leq t_i : C} \quad (\text{T-UPDATE})$$

Answer: Also possible to replace $\text{fields}(C) = \bar{C} \bar{F}$ with $\Gamma \vdash t.f_i : C_i$
 Grading scheme: 2pts per premise. -3 for common error, $\Gamma \vdash t_i : C$.

- (b) Recall the statement of the progress theorem for FJ:

THEOREM (PROGRESS): Suppose t is a closed, well-typed normal form. Then either (1) t is a value, or (2) for some evaluation context E , we can express t as $E[(C) (\text{new } D(\bar{v}))]$, with $D \not\prec C$.

This theorem relies on the following definition of *evaluation contexts* for FJ.

$E ::=$
 $[\]$
 $E.f$
 $E.m(\bar{E})$
 $v.m(\bar{v}, E, \bar{E})$
 $\text{new } C(\bar{v}, E, \bar{E})$
 $(C)E$

What new evaluation contexts are required for functional field update?

Answer: $E.f \leq t$ and $v.f \leq E$

Grading scheme: 2 pts per answer

Companion handout

**Full definitions of the systems
used in the exam**

Untyped lambda-calculus

Syntax

$t ::=$
 x
 $\lambda x. t$
 $t t$

$v ::=$
 $\lambda x. t$

Evaluation

$$\frac{t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1}{t_1 t_2 \longrightarrow t'_1 t_2} \quad \text{(E-APP1)}$$
$$\frac{t_2 \longrightarrow t'_2}{v_1 t_2 \longrightarrow v_1 t'_2} \quad \text{(E-APP2)}$$
$$(\lambda x. t_{12}) v_2 \longrightarrow [x \mapsto v_2] t_{12} \quad \text{(E-APPABS)}$$

terms

variable
abstraction
application

values

abstraction value

$t \longrightarrow t'$

Simply typed lambda calculus (with `Bool` and recursion)

Syntax

$t ::=$
`true`
`false`
`if t then t else t`
`x`
 $\lambda x:T. t$
`t t`
`fix t`

$v ::=$
`true`
`false`
 $\lambda x:T. t$

$T ::=$
`Bool`
 $T \rightarrow T$

$\Gamma ::=$
 \emptyset
 $\Gamma, x:T$

terms

constant true
constant false
conditional
variable
abstraction
application
fixed point of t

values

true value
false value
abstraction value

types

type of booleans
type of functions

contexts

empty context
term variable binding

Evaluation

	$t \rightarrow t'$
<code>if true then t₂ else t₃ → t₂</code>	(E-IFTRUE)
<code>if false then t₂ else t₃ → t₃</code>	(E-IFFALSE)
$\frac{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}{\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 \rightarrow \text{if } t'_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3}$	(E-IF)
$\frac{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}{t_1 t_2 \rightarrow t'_1 t_2}$	(E-APP1)
$\frac{t_2 \rightarrow t'_2}{v_1 t_2 \rightarrow v_1 t'_2}$	(E-APP2)
$(\lambda x:T_1. t_{12}) v_2 \rightarrow [x \mapsto v_2]t_{12}$	(E-APPABS)
$\text{fix}(\lambda x:T_1. t_2) \rightarrow [x \mapsto \text{fix}(\lambda x:T_1. t_2)]t_2$	(E-FIXBETA)
$\frac{t_1 \rightarrow t'_1}{\text{fix } t_1 \rightarrow \text{fix } t'_1}$	(E-FIX)

Typing

	$\Gamma \vdash \text{true} : \text{Bool}$	$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash t : T}$
	$\Gamma \vdash \text{false} : \text{Bool}$	(T-TRUE)
	$\Gamma \vdash \text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 : T$	(T-FALSE)
	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : \text{Bool} \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T \quad \Gamma \vdash t_3 : T}{\Gamma \vdash \text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 : T}$	(T-IF)
	$\frac{x : T \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : T}$	(T-VAR)
	$\frac{\Gamma, x : T_1 \vdash t_2 : T_2}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x : T_1. t_2 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2}$	(T-ABS)
	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_1}{\Gamma \vdash t_1 t_2 : T_2}$	(T-APP)
	$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T_1}{\Gamma \vdash \text{fix } t_1 : T_1}$	(T-FIX)

Pure simply typed lambda calculus with subtyping (no records) — algorithmic rules

Syntax

$t ::=$
 x
 $\lambda x:T.t$
 $t t$

$v ::=$
 $\lambda x:T.t$

$T ::=$
 Top
 $T \rightarrow T$

$\Gamma ::=$
 \emptyset
 $\Gamma, x:T$

terms

variable
abstraction
application

values

abstraction value

types

maximum type
type of functions

contexts

empty context
term variable binding

Evaluation

$$\boxed{t \longrightarrow t'}$$

$$\frac{t_1 \longrightarrow t'_1}{t_1 t_2 \longrightarrow t'_1 t_2} \quad (\text{E-APP1})$$

$$\frac{t_2 \longrightarrow t'_2}{v_1 t_2 \longrightarrow v_1 t'_2} \quad (\text{E-APP2})$$

$$(\lambda x:T_{11}.t_{12}) v_2 \longrightarrow [x \mapsto v_2]t_{12} \quad (\text{E-APPABS})$$

Algorithmic subtyping

$$\boxed{\vdash S <: T}$$

$$\vdash S <: \text{Top} \quad (\text{SA-TOP})$$

$$\frac{\vdash T_1 <: S_1 \quad \vdash S_2 <: T_2}{\vdash S_1 \rightarrow S_2 <: T_1 \rightarrow T_2} \quad (\text{SA-ARROW})$$

Algorithmic typing

$$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash t : T}$$

$$\frac{x:T \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : T} \quad (\text{TA-VAR})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma, x:T_1 \vdash t_2 : T_2}{\Gamma \vdash \lambda x:T_1. t_2 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2} \quad (\text{TA-ABS})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 : T_1 \quad T_1 = T_{11} \rightarrow T_{12} \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 : T_2 \quad \vdash T_2 <: T_{11}}{\Gamma \vdash t_1 t_2 : T_{12}} \quad (\text{TA-APP})$$

Simply typed lambda calculus with subtyping (and records, references, recursion, booleans, numbers)

Syntax

$t ::=$
 x
 $\lambda x:T.t$
 $t t$
 $\{l_i = t_i \mid i \in 1..n\}$
 $t.l$
 unit
 $\text{ref } t$
 $!t$
 $t := t$
 l
 true
 false
 $\text{if } t \text{ then } t \text{ else } t$
 0
 $\text{succ } t$
 $\text{pred } t$
 $\text{iszero } t$
 $\text{let } x=t \text{ in } t$
 $\text{fix } t$

$v ::=$
 $\lambda x:T.t$
 $\{l_i = v_i \mid i \in 1..n\}$
 unit
 l
 true
 false
 nv

$T ::=$
 $\{l_i : T_i \mid i \in 1..n\}$
 Top
 $T \rightarrow T$
 Unit
 $\text{Ref } T$
 Bool
 Nat

$\Gamma ::=$
 \emptyset
 $\Gamma, x:T$

$\mu ::=$
 \emptyset

terms

variable
abstraction
application
record
projection
constant unit
reference creation
dereference
assignment
store location
constant true
constant false
conditional
constant zero
successor
predecessor
zero test
let binding
fixed point of t

values

abstraction value
record value
constant unit
store location
true value
false value
numeric value

types

type of records
maximum type
type of functions
unit type
type of reference cells
type of booleans
type of natural numbers

contexts

empty context
term variable binding

stores

empty store

$\mu, l = v$
 $\Sigma ::=$
 \emptyset
 $\Sigma, l : T$
 $nv ::=$
 0
 $\text{succ } nv$

location binding
store typings
empty store typing
location typing

numeric values
zero value
successor value

Evaluation

$t \mid \mu \longrightarrow t' \mid \mu'$

$$\frac{t_1 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 \mid \mu'}{t_1 \ t_2 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 \ t_2 \mid \mu'} \quad (\text{E-APP1})$$

$$\frac{t_2 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_2 \mid \mu'}{v_1 \ t_2 \mid \mu \longrightarrow v_1 \ t'_2 \mid \mu'} \quad (\text{E-APP2})$$

$$(\lambda x : T_{11} . t_{12}) \ v_2 \mid \mu \longrightarrow [x \mapsto v_2] t_{12} \mid \mu \quad (\text{E-APPABS})$$

$$\{l_i = v_i \mid i \in 1..n\} . l_j \mid \mu \longrightarrow v_j \mid \mu \quad (\text{E-PROJRCD})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 \mid \mu'}{t_1 . l \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 . l \mid \mu'} \quad (\text{E-PROJ})$$

$$\frac{t_j \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_j \mid \mu'}{\{l_i = v_i \mid i \in 1..j-1, l_j = t_j, l_k = t_k \mid k \in j+1..n\} \mid \mu \longrightarrow \{l_i = v_i \mid i \in 1..j-1, l_j = t'_j, l_k = t_k \mid k \in j+1..n\} \mid \mu'} \quad (\text{E-RCD})$$

$$\frac{l \notin \text{dom}(\mu)}{\text{ref } v_1 \mid \mu \longrightarrow l \mid (\mu, l \mapsto v_1)} \quad (\text{E-REFV})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 \mid \mu'}{\text{ref } t_1 \mid \mu \longrightarrow \text{ref } t'_1 \mid \mu'} \quad (\text{E-REF})$$

$$\frac{\mu(l) = v}{!l \mid \mu \longrightarrow v \mid \mu} \quad (\text{E-DEREFLOC})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 \mid \mu'}{!t_1 \mid \mu \longrightarrow !t'_1 \mid \mu'} \quad (\text{E-DEREF})$$

$$l := v_2 \mid \mu \longrightarrow \text{unit} \mid [l \mapsto v_2] \mu \quad (\text{E-ASSIGN})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 \mid \mu'}{t_1 := t_2 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 := t_2 \mid \mu'} \quad (\text{E-ASSIGN1})$$

$$\frac{t_2 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_2 \mid \mu'}{v_1 := t_2 \mid \mu \longrightarrow v_1 := t'_2 \mid \mu'} \quad (\text{E-ASSIGN2})$$

$$\text{if true then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t_2 \mid \mu \quad (\text{E-IFTRUE})$$

$$\text{if false then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t_3 \mid \mu \quad (\text{E-IFFALSE})$$

$$\frac{t_1 \mid \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 \mid \mu'}{\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 \mid \mu \longrightarrow \text{if } t'_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 \mid \mu'} \quad (\text{E-IF})$$

$\frac{t_1 \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 \mu'}{\text{succ } t_1 \mu \longrightarrow \text{succ } t'_1 \mu'}$	(E-SUCC)
$\text{pred } 0 \mu \longrightarrow 0 \mu$	(E-PREDZERO)
$\text{pred } (\text{succ } nv_1) \mu \longrightarrow nv_1 \mu$	(E-PREDSUCC)
$\frac{t_1 \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 \mu'}{\text{pred } t_1 \mu \longrightarrow \text{pred } t'_1 \mu}$	(E-PRED)
$\text{iszero } 0 \mu \longrightarrow \text{true} \mu$	(E-ISZEROZERO)
$\text{iszero } (\text{succ } nv_1) \mu \longrightarrow \text{false} \mu$	(E-ISZEROSUCC)
$\frac{t_1 \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 \mu'}{\text{iszero } t_1 \mu \longrightarrow \text{iszero } t'_1 \mu'}$	(E-ISZERO)
$\text{let } x=v_1 \text{ in } t_2 \mu \longrightarrow [x \mapsto v_1]t_2 \mu$	(E-LETV)
$\frac{t_1 \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 \mu'}{\text{let } x=t_1 \text{ in } t_2 \mu \longrightarrow \text{let } x=t'_1 \text{ in } t_2 \mu'}$	(E-LET)
$\begin{array}{l} \text{fix } (\lambda x:T_1. t_2) \mu \\ \longrightarrow [x \mapsto (\text{fix } (\lambda x:T_1. t_2))]t_2 \mu \end{array}$	(E-FIXBETA)
$\frac{t_1 \mu \longrightarrow t'_1 \mu'}{\text{fix } t_1 \mu \longrightarrow \text{fix } t'_1 \mu}$	(E-FIX)

Subtyping

$S <: S$	$\boxed{S <: T}$ (S-REFL)
$\frac{S <: U \quad U <: T}{S <: T}$	(S-TRANS)
$S <: \text{Top}$	(S-TOP)
$\frac{T_1 <: S_1 \quad S_2 <: T_2}{S_1 \rightarrow S_2 <: T_1 \rightarrow T_2}$	(S-ARROW)
$\{l_i : T_i^{i \in 1..n+k}\} <: \{l_i : T_i^{i \in 1..n}\}$	(S-RCDWIDTH)
$\frac{\text{for each } i \quad S_i <: T_i}{\{l_i : S_i^{i \in 1..n}\} <: \{l_i : T_i^{i \in 1..n}\}}$	(S-RCDDEPTH)
$\frac{\{k_j : S_j^{j \in 1..n}\} \text{ is a permutation of } \{l_i : T_i^{i \in 1..n}\}}{\{k_j : S_j^{j \in 1..n}\} <: \{l_i : T_i^{i \in 1..n}\}}$	(S-RCDPERM)

$\frac{\text{for each } i \quad \Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_i : T_i}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \{l_i = t_i \mid i \in 1..n\} : \{l_i : T_i \mid i \in 1..n\}}$	(T-RCD)
$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1 : \{l_i : T_i \mid i \in 1..n\}}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1.l_j : T_j}$	(T-PROJ)
$\frac{x : T \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash x : T}$	(T-VAR)
$\frac{\Gamma, x : T_1 \mid \Sigma \vdash t_2 : T_2}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \lambda x : T_1. t_2 : T_1 \rightarrow T_2}$	(T-ABS)
$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1 : T_{11} \rightarrow T_{12} \quad \Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_2 : T_{11}}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1 t_2 : T_{12}}$	(T-APP)
$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t : S \quad S <: T}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t : T}$	(T-SUB)
$\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \text{unit} : \text{Unit}$	(T-UNIT)
$\frac{\Sigma(l) = T_1}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash l : \text{Ref } T_1}$	(T-LOC)
$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1 : T_1}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \text{ref } t_1 : \text{Ref } T_1}$	(T-REF)
$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1 : \text{Ref } T_{11}}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash !t_1 : T_{11}}$	(T-DEREF)
$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1 : \text{Ref } T_{11} \quad \Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_2 : T_{11}}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1 := t_2 : \text{Unit}}$	(T-ASSIGN)
$\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \text{true} : \text{Bool}$	(T-TRUE)
$\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \text{false} : \text{Bool}$	(T-FALSE)
$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1 : \text{Bool} \quad \Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_2 : T \quad \Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_3 : T}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 : T}$	(T-IF)
$\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash 0 : \text{Nat}$	(T-ZERO)
$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1 : \text{Nat}}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \text{succ } t_1 : \text{Nat}}$	(T-SUCC)
$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1 : \text{Nat}}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \text{pred } t_1 : \text{Nat}}$	(T-PRED)
$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1 : \text{Nat}}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \text{iszero } t_1 : \text{Bool}}$	(T-ISZERO)
$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1 : T_1 \quad \Gamma, x : T_1 \mid \Sigma \vdash t_2 : T_2}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \text{let } x = t_1 \text{ in } t_2 : T_2}$	(T-LET)
$\frac{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash t_1 : T_1 \rightarrow T_1}{\Gamma \mid \Sigma \vdash \text{fix } t_1 : T_1}$	(T-FIX)

Featherweight Java

Syntax

$CL ::=$
 $\text{class } C \text{ extends } C \{ \bar{C} \bar{F}; \kappa \bar{M} \}$

$K ::=$
 $C(\bar{C} \bar{F}) \{ \text{super}(\bar{f}); \text{this}.\bar{f} = \bar{f}; \}$

$M ::=$
 $C m(\bar{C} \bar{x}) \{ \text{return } t; \}$

$t ::=$
 x
 $t.f$
 $t.m(\bar{E})$
 $\text{new } C(\bar{E})$
 $(C) t$

$v ::=$
 $\text{new } C(\bar{v})$

class declarations

constructor declarations

method declarations

terms

variable
field access
method invocation
object creation
cast

values

object creation

Subtyping

$C <: D$

$$\begin{array}{c}
 C <: C \\
 \frac{C <: D \quad D <: E}{C <: E} \\
 \frac{CT(C) = \text{class } C \text{ extends } D \{ \dots \}}{C <: D}
 \end{array}$$

Field lookup

$fields(C) = \bar{C} \bar{F}$

$$\begin{array}{c}
 fields(\text{Object}) = \bullet \\
 \frac{CT(C) = \text{class } C \text{ extends } D \{ \bar{C} \bar{F}; \kappa \bar{M} \} \quad fields(D) = \bar{D} \bar{G}}{fields(C) = \bar{D} \bar{G}, \bar{C} \bar{F}}
 \end{array}$$

Method type lookup

$mtype(m, C) = \bar{C} \rightarrow C$

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{CT(C) = \text{class } C \text{ extends } D \{ \bar{C} \bar{F}; \kappa \bar{M} \} \quad B m(\bar{B} \bar{x}) \{ \text{return } t; \} \in \bar{M}}{mtype(m, C) = \bar{B} \rightarrow B} \\
 \frac{CT(C) = \text{class } C \text{ extends } D \{ \bar{C} \bar{F}; \kappa \bar{M} \} \quad m \text{ is not defined in } \bar{M}}{mtype(m, C) = mtype(m, D)}
 \end{array}$$

Method body lookup

$mbody(m, C) = (\bar{x}, t)$

$$\frac{CT(C) = \text{class } C \text{ extends } D \{ \bar{C} \bar{f}; \kappa \bar{M} \} \quad B \ m \ (\bar{B} \bar{x}) \ \{ \text{return } t; \} \in \bar{M}}{mbody(m, C) = (\bar{x}, t)}$$

$$\frac{CT(C) = \text{class } C \text{ extends } D \{ \bar{C} \bar{f}; \kappa \bar{M} \} \quad m \text{ is not defined in } \bar{M}}{mbody(m, C) = mbody(m, D)}$$

Valid method overriding

$$\boxed{\text{override}(m, D, \bar{C} \rightarrow C_0)}$$

$$\frac{mtype(m, D) = \bar{D} \rightarrow D_0 \text{ implies } \bar{C} = \bar{D} \text{ and } C_0 = D_0}{\text{override}(m, D, \bar{C} \rightarrow C_0)}$$

Evaluation

$$\boxed{t \longrightarrow t'}$$

$$\frac{fields(C) = \bar{C} \bar{f}}{(new\ C(\bar{v})) . f_i \longrightarrow v_i} \quad (\text{E-PROJNEW})$$

$$\frac{mbody(m, C) = (\bar{x}, t_0)}{(new\ C(\bar{v})) . m(\bar{u}) \longrightarrow [\bar{x} \mapsto \bar{u}, \text{this} \mapsto new\ C(\bar{v})] t_0} \quad (\text{E-INVKNOW})$$

$$\frac{C <: D}{(D) (new\ C(\bar{v})) \longrightarrow new\ C(\bar{v})} \quad (\text{E-CASTNEW})$$

$$\frac{t_0 \longrightarrow t'_0}{t_0 . f \longrightarrow t'_0 . f} \quad (\text{E-FIELD})$$

$$\frac{t_0 \longrightarrow t'_0}{t_0 . m(\bar{e}) \longrightarrow t'_0 . m(\bar{e})} \quad (\text{E-INVK-RECV})$$

$$\frac{t_i \longrightarrow t'_i}{v_0 . m(\bar{v}, t_i, \bar{e}) \longrightarrow v_0 . m(\bar{v}, t'_i, \bar{e})} \quad (\text{E-INVK-ARG})$$

$$\frac{t_i \longrightarrow t'_i}{new\ C(\bar{v}, t_i, \bar{e}) \longrightarrow new\ C(\bar{v}, t'_i, \bar{e})} \quad (\text{E-NEW-ARG})$$

$$\frac{t_0 \longrightarrow t'_0}{(C) t_0 \longrightarrow (C) t'_0} \quad (\text{E-CAST})$$

Term typing

$$\boxed{\Gamma \vdash t : C}$$

$$\frac{x : C \in \Gamma}{\Gamma \vdash x : C} \quad (\text{T-VAR})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_0 : C_0 \quad fields(C_0) = \bar{C} \bar{f}}{\Gamma \vdash t_0 . f_i : C_i} \quad (\text{T-FIELD})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_0 : C_0 \quad mtype(m, C_0) = \bar{D} \rightarrow C \quad \Gamma \vdash \bar{e} : \bar{C} \quad \bar{C} <: \bar{D}}{\Gamma \vdash t_0 . m(\bar{e}) : C} \quad (\text{T-INVK})$$

$$\frac{\text{fields}(C) = \bar{D} \bar{F} \quad \Gamma \vdash \bar{E} : \bar{C} \quad \bar{C} <: \bar{D}}{\Gamma \vdash \text{new } C(\bar{E}) : C} \quad (\text{T-NEW})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_0 : D \quad D <: C}{\Gamma \vdash (C)t_0 : C} \quad (\text{T-UCAST})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_0 : D \quad C <: D \quad C \neq D}{\Gamma \vdash (C)t_0 : C} \quad (\text{T-DCAST})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_0 : D \quad C \not<: D \quad D \not<: C \quad \text{stupid warning}}{\Gamma \vdash (C)t_0 : C} \quad (\text{T-SCAST})$$

Method typing

M OK in C

$$\frac{\bar{x} : \bar{C}, \text{this} : C \vdash t_0 : E_0 \quad E_0 <: C_0 \quad \text{CT}(C) = \text{class } C \text{ extends } D \{ \dots \} \quad \text{override}(m, D, \bar{C} \rightarrow C_0)}{C_0 \text{ m } (\bar{C} \bar{x}) \{ \text{return } t_0 ; \} \text{ OK in } C}$$

Class typing

C OK

$$\frac{\kappa = C(\bar{D} \bar{g}, \bar{C} \bar{f}) \quad \{ \text{super}(\bar{g}) ; \text{this}.\bar{f} = \bar{f} ; \} \quad \text{fields}(D) = \bar{D} \bar{g} \quad \bar{M} \text{ OK in } C}{\text{class } C \text{ extends } D \{ \bar{C} \bar{f} ; \kappa \bar{M} \} \text{ OK}}$$