Technische Universität Wien
Fakultät für Informatik
Assist. Prof. Florian Zuleger
Assist. Prof. Georg Weissenbacher
Yulia Demyanova, Mag.
Moritz Sinn, M.Sc.

SS 2015 Exercise 1 Thursday, 26 March 2015

Exercises on Semantics of Programming Languages

Solutions are to be handed in at the lecture on April 13th. Later submissions will not be accepted.

Exercise 1 Determinism of Big-step Semantics

(5 Points)

Consider the Big-step semantics of the **While** language as defined in the lecture. Prove the following theorem from the lecture:

If
$$\langle C, s \rangle \Downarrow s_1$$
 and $\langle C, s \rangle \Downarrow s_2$ then $s_1 = s_2$.

Hint: Use rule-based induction.

Exercise 2 Properties of Small-step Semantics

(5 Points)

Proof the following theorems from the lecture:

- a) If $\langle C_1; C_2, s \rangle \to^k s'$ then there exists a state s'' and natural numbers k_1 and k_2 s.t. $\langle C_1; s \rangle \to^{k_1} s''$ and $\langle C_2; s'' \rangle \to^{k_2} s'$ where $k_1 + k_2 = k$.
- b) If $\langle C_1, s \rangle \to^k s'$ then $\langle C_1, C_2, s \rangle \to^k \langle C_2, s' \rangle$.
- c) Does b) also hold the other way around? I.e., does $\langle C_1, s \rangle \to^k s'$ follow from $\langle C_1; C_2, s \rangle \to^k \langle C_2, s' \rangle$? Prove or disprove.

Exercise 3 Equivalence of Small-step and Big-step Semantics

(5 Points)

Consider the definition of Small-step semantics given in the lecture and the following alternative rule for the while-construct:

S-WHILE
$$\overline{\text{(while b do } C,s)} \rightarrow \text{(if b then } (C; \text{ while b do } C) \text{ else skip},s)$$

Let $[C]_{S'}$ be defined as:

$$\llbracket C \rrbracket_{S'} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} s' \text{ if } \langle C, s \rangle \to^* s' \text{ using S-WHILE instead of S-WHILE.T and S-WHILE.F} \\ \bot \text{ otherwise} \end{array} \right.$$

Proof that $[\![C]\!]_{S'} = [\![C]\!]_B$. You may cite appropriate parts of the proof for $[\![C]\!]_S = [\![C]\!]_B$ given in the lecture.

In Exercise 1 from the repetition sheet (dated 26th of March)(*) Big-step semantics of arithmetic expressions are defined, i.e., by the specified rules a given arithmetic expression is evaluated to an integer in one step. We give an example:

Consider the state $s = \{x \mapsto 5, y \mapsto 3, z \mapsto 4\}$. With the definition of \rightarrow_{Aexp} in (*) it holds that $\langle (x+y) + z, s \rangle \rightarrow_{Aexp} 12$.

We now want to define Small-step semantics of arithmetic expressions by a derivation relation $\langle e, s \rangle \to_{AS} \gamma$ where γ is either of the form $\langle e', s \rangle$ or n where n is a numeral. If γ is of form $\langle e', s \rangle$ then the evaluation of e in state s is not completed and the partial evaluation is expressed by the intermediate configuration $\langle e', s \rangle$. If γ is of form n then e was evaluated to n in s.

E.g., instead of evaluating $\langle (x+y)+z,s \rangle$ directly to its final value 12 in s, this expression is evaluated as follows:

$$\langle (x+y)+z,s \rangle \rightarrow_{AS} \langle (5+y)+z,s \rangle \rightarrow_{AS} \langle (5+3)+z,s \rangle \rightarrow_{AS} \langle (8+z,s) \rightarrow_{AS} \langle (8+4,s) \rightarrow_{AS} (12+s) \rangle \rightarrow_{AS} \langle (5+y)+z,s \rangle \rightarrow_{AS} \langle (5+z)+z,s \rangle \rightarrow_{AS}$$

- a) Define Small-step semantics of arithmetic expressions by defining the derivation relation $\langle e, s \rangle \to_{AS} \gamma$ appropriately. It is sufficient to consider the addition operator + since the operators * and can be handled accordingly.
- b) Extend the definition of Small-step semantics of the WHILE language given in the lecture s.t. arithmetic expressions are evaluated stepwise (by \rightarrow_{AS}) in assignments. I.e., given an assignment x := e where e is an arithmetic expression, e shall first be evaluated stepwise to a numeral before the state is finally updated in order to handle the assignment.