308 Suppose variable declaration with initialization is defined as **new** $x: T := e \cdot P = new x: T \cdot x := e \cdot P$ In what way does this differ from the definition given in Subsection 5.0.0?

After trying the question, scroll down to the solution.

According to Subsection 5.0.0, **new** $x: T := e \cdot P$ $\equiv \exists x: e \cdot \exists x': T \cdot P$

- $= (\text{for } x \text{ substitute } e \text{ in } \exists x': T \cdot P)$
- $= \exists x': T \cdot (\text{for } x \text{ substitute } e \text{ in } P)$ $= \exists x: T \cdot \exists x': T \cdot (\text{for } x \text{ substitute } e \text{ in } P)$ $= \exists x, x': T \cdot (x:=e, P)$ $= \text{new } x: T \cdot x:=e, P$

assuming T cannot mention x and e cannot mention x'assuming e cannot mention x substitution law

With the three assumptions, there's no difference. So let's violate those assumptions. First, let T = x+1.

 $new x: x+1 \cdot x:= e. P$ = $\exists x, x': x+1 \cdot (x:= e. P)$ = $\exists \langle x: x+1 \cdot \exists x': x+1 \cdot (x:= e. P) \rangle$

Section 3.0 defines a function by saying "Let v be a name, and let D be a bunch of items (possibly using previously introduced names but not using v), ...". We do not have a definition of $\langle x: x+1 \cdots \rangle$.

Next, suppose e = x+1.

 $\mathbf{new} \ x: \ T := x + 1 \cdot P$ = $\exists x: x + 1 \cdot \exists x': \ T \cdot P$ = $\exists \langle x: x + 1 \cdot \exists x': \ T \cdot P \rangle$

So again we do not have a definition of $\langle x: x+1 \cdots \rangle$.

Last, suppose e = x'+1.

 $= \frac{\mathbf{new} \ x: \ T := x' + 1 \cdot P}{\exists x: \ x' + 1 \cdot \exists x': \ T \cdot P}$

The x' appearing first is not the same variable as the x' appearing second.

§