Assignment on Operational Semantics

All the problems use the language HW whose syntax and small-step operational semantics are given in the appendix at the end of this document.

- 1. Suppose $(c_1; c_2, \sigma) \longrightarrow^* (c_2, \sigma')$. Show that it is not necessarily the case that $(c_1, \sigma) \longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{skip}, \sigma')$.
- 2. In this problem we add the expressions x++ and ++x to the language HW. We extend the syntax as follows:

$$(IExp)$$
 e ::= ... | $x++$ | $++x$

The expression x++ returns the value of the variable x and then increments x (i.e. updates the value of x to be one greater than the old value). Its semantics can be formalized as follows:

$$\frac{\sigma(x) = \lfloor \mathbf{n} \rfloor}{(x++,\sigma) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{n}, \sigma\{x \leadsto \lfloor \mathbf{n} \rfloor + 1\})}$$

- (a) Give the small-step operational semantics rule for ++x, which increments x and then returns the result.
- (b) Give the full execution path for the program

while
$$x < 2$$
 do $x := (x++) + (++x)$

from the initial state $\{x \rightsquigarrow 1\}$.

3. In this problem we add "side-effecting expressions" to the language HW. We extend the syntax as follows:

$$(\mathit{IExp}) \quad e \quad ::= \quad \dots \mid \ \mathsf{do} \ c \ \mathsf{return} \ e$$

The new expression first runs the command c and then returns the value of e. For example, do x := 1 return x will set x to 1 and return 1.

- (a) Give the small-step operational semantics rules for the new expression do c return e.
- (b) We define \prec between two expressions as follows (here we write \longrightarrow^* for zero-or-multiple steps of \longrightarrow):

$$e_1 \prec e_2$$
 iff
 $\forall \sigma, \mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2. \ ((e_1, \sigma) \longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{n}_1, \sigma_1)) \land ((e_2, \sigma) \longrightarrow^* (\mathbf{n}_2, \sigma_2))$
 $\Rightarrow (|\mathbf{n}_1| < |\mathbf{n}_2|)$

For each of the following properties, does it hold? If your answer is yes, just say yes. If your answer is no, give a counterexample (that is, in (i) and (ii), instantiate e_1, e_2 so that the relation \prec breaks; in (iii), instantiate e so that $e \prec e$; in (iv), instantiate e_1, e_2, e_3 so that the implication fails) and explain why the property does not hold at your example.

- i. $\forall e_1, e_2. (e_1 + e_2) \prec (e_1 + e_2 + 1)$
- ii. $\forall e_1, e_2. (e_1 + e_2) \prec (e_2 + e_1 + \mathbf{1})$
- iii. $\forall e. \ \neg(e \prec e)$
- iv. $\forall e_1, e_2, e_3. \ (e_1 \prec e_2) \land (e_2 \prec e_3) \ \Rightarrow \ (e_1 \prec e_3)$

Appendix: The Language HW

Syntax:

$$\begin{array}{llll} (\mathit{IExp}) & e & ::= & \mathbf{n} \mid x \mid e + e \mid \dots \\ (\mathit{BExp}) & b & ::= & \mathbf{true} \mid \mathbf{false} \mid e < e \mid \dots \\ (\mathit{Comm}) & c & ::= & \mathbf{skip} \mid x := e \mid c \ ; c \mid \mathbf{if} \ b \ \mathbf{then} \ c \ \mathbf{else} \ c \mid \mathbf{while} \ b \ \mathbf{do} \ c \\ (\mathit{State}) & \sigma & \in & \mathit{Var} \rightarrow \mathit{Nat} \end{array}$$

Small-step operational semantics rules:

Zero-or-more steps:

$$\begin{aligned} &(c,\sigma) \to^0 (c',\sigma') & \text{iff} \quad (c,\sigma) = (c',\sigma') \\ &(c,\sigma) \to^{k+1} (c',\sigma') & \text{iff} \quad \exists c'',\sigma''. \ (c,\sigma) \to (c'',\sigma'') \land (c'',\sigma'') \to^k (c',\sigma') \\ &(c,\sigma) \to^* (c',\sigma') & \text{iff} \quad \exists k. \ (c,\sigma) \to^k (c',\sigma') \end{aligned}$$