

Theorem 3

If (1)  $P, P \vdash e : t$

then

(2)  $\mathcal{E}(P), P \vdash \mathcal{P}(e) : t$

Proof by structural induction on 1. Consider the last rule applied.

1st Case ST NULL, ST-WLD, ST-INT-X, ST-NEW. trivial.

2nd Case ST-INV. Therefore

(3)  $e = e_1, m(e_2)$

(4)  $P, P \vdash e_1 : c$

(5)  $\mathcal{M}(P, c) = t \ m(t')$

(6)  $P, P \vdash e_2 : t'$

Apply I.H. on 4 and 6 and obtain

(7)  $\mathcal{E}(P), P \vdash \mathcal{P}(e_1) : c$

(8)  $\mathcal{E}(P), P \vdash \mathcal{P}(e_2) : t'$

Apply def on encoding on 5 and obtain

(9)  $t \ m(t') \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{E}(P), c, m)$

Apply ST-INV on 7, 8, 9, 3 and 2 is proven.

3rd Case ST-SLD, similar to 2nd case

4th Case FLD-SL-RD. Therefore

(3)  $e = e_1, f$

(4)  $\exists(P, c, f) = t$

(5)  $P, P \vdash e_1 : c$

Apply def of  $\mathcal{E}$  on 5 and obtain

2<sup>nd</sup> case ASYNC Therefore we obtain

- (7)  $e' = \text{word}$
- (8)  $h(e) = \{c \parallel q_s\}$
- (9)  $M(P, c, m) = \text{async } m(t')$
- (10)  $W = h[L \mapsto [c \parallel q_s [m \mapsto \{v \parallel q_s(m)\}]]]$
- (11)  $e = L.m(v)$

Consider (3). The last rule applied was INV or SUB.  
 2.1<sup>st</sup> case Last rule in (3) was INV.

- (12)  $P, h \vdash L : c''$
- (13)  $M(P, c'', m) = t'' m(t''')$
- (14)  $P, h \vdash v : t''''$

From (10) and (8) we obtain

(15)  $P \vdash c \leq c''$

From (13) and (9) and (1) and Aux we obtain

(16)  $t'' = \text{async}$  or  $t'' = \text{word}$ ,  $t' = t''''$

From (14) and (16) and (1) we obtain

(17)  $P, h' \vdash L : c'$

and (17) together with (11) and (1)

5 is established.

Also

6 is established from 7, 16 and R1 SUB Aux

2.2 Case Last rule was SUB. Can only be the case were reference to word in 2.1 case.