

Elements of Programming Languages

Tutorial 7: Small-step semantics

Solution notes

1. Imperative programming

(a) $y := x + x$

$$\frac{\overline{3 + 3 \Downarrow 6}}{\sigma, y := x + x \Downarrow \sigma[y := 6]}$$

(b) $\text{if } x == y \text{ then } x := x + 1 \text{ else } y := y + 2$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} 3 \Downarrow 3 \quad 4 \Downarrow 4 \\ 3 == 4 \Downarrow \text{true} \end{array} \quad \frac{4 + 2 \Downarrow 6}{\sigma, y := y + 2 \Downarrow \sigma[y := 6]}}{\sigma, \text{if } x == y \text{ then } x := x + 1 \text{ else } y := y + 2 \Downarrow \sigma[y := 6]}$$

(c) $(*) \text{while } x < y \text{ do } x := x + 1$

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} 3 + 1 \Downarrow 4 \\ 3 < 4 \Downarrow \text{true} \end{array} \quad \frac{\begin{array}{c} 4 < 4 \Downarrow \text{false} \\ \sigma[x := 4], \text{while } x < y \text{ do } x := x + 1 \Downarrow \sigma[x := 4] \end{array}}{\sigma, \text{while } x < y \text{ do } x := x + 1 \Downarrow \sigma[x := 4]}}$$

2. Comparing large-step and small-step derivations

(a) For large-step:

$$\frac{\lambda x.x + 1 \Downarrow \lambda x.x + 1 \quad 42 \Downarrow 42}{(\lambda x.x + 1) 42 \Downarrow 43} \quad \frac{\begin{array}{c} 42 \Downarrow 42 \quad 1 \Downarrow 1 \\ 42 + 1 \Downarrow 43 \end{array}}{42 + 1 \Downarrow 43}$$

For small-step, the step derivations are:

$$\frac{\overline{(\lambda x.x + 1) 42 \mapsto 42 + 1}}{\overline{42 + 1 \mapsto 43}}$$

(b) For large-step:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} 42 \Downarrow 42 \quad 1 \Downarrow 1 \\ 42 == 1 \Downarrow \text{false} \end{array} \quad \frac{\begin{array}{c} 42 \Downarrow 42 \quad 1 \Downarrow 1 \\ 42 + 1 \Downarrow 43 \end{array}}{42 + 1 \Downarrow 43}}{f \Downarrow f \quad 42 \Downarrow 42 \quad \text{if } 42 == 1 \text{ then } 2 \text{ else } 42 + 1 \Downarrow 43} \quad (\lambda x.\text{if } x == 1 \text{ then } 2 \text{ else } x + 1) 42 \Downarrow 43$$

For small-step, the step derivations are:

$$\overline{(\lambda x.\text{if } x == 1 \text{ then } 2 \text{ else } x + 1) 42 \mapsto \text{if } 42 == 1 \text{ then } 2 \text{ else } 42 + 1}$$

$$\overline{\text{if } 42 == 1 \mapsto \text{false}} \quad \overline{\text{if } 42 == 1 \text{ then } 2 \text{ else } 42 + 1 \mapsto \text{if false then } 2 \text{ else } 42 + 1}$$

$$\overline{\text{if false then } 2 \text{ else } 42 + 1 \mapsto 42 + 1}$$

$$\overline{42 + 1 \mapsto 43}$$

3. Small-step derivations that go wrong

(a) The small-step derivation is:

$$\begin{aligned} ((\lambda x. \lambda y. \text{let } z = x + y \text{ in } z + 1) 42) \text{ true} &\mapsto (\lambda y. \text{let } z = 42 + y \text{ in } z + 1) \text{ true} \\ &\mapsto \text{let } z = 42 + \text{true} \text{ in } z + 1 \end{aligned}$$

which is stuck because the next subexpression to evaluate, $42 + \text{true}$, cannot take a step.

(b) The small-step derivation is:

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda x. \text{if } x \text{ then } x + 1 \text{ else } x + 2) \text{ true} &\mapsto \text{if true then true} + 1 \text{ else true} + 2 \\ &\mapsto \text{true} + 1 \end{aligned}$$

4. Small-step rules for L_{Data}

(a) Here are some possible rules:

$$e \mapsto e'$$

$$\frac{}{e \mapsto e'} \quad \frac{e_1 \mapsto e'_1 \quad e_2 \mapsto e'_2}{(e_1, e_2) \mapsto (e'_1, e'_2)} \quad \frac{}{(v_1, e_2) \mapsto (v_1, e'_2)}$$

$$\frac{}{\text{fst } (v_1, v_2) \mapsto v_1} \quad \frac{}{\text{snd } (v_1, v_2) \mapsto v_2}$$

$$\frac{e \mapsto e'}{\text{fst } e \mapsto \text{fst } e'} \quad \frac{e \mapsto e'}{\text{snd } e \mapsto \text{snd } e'}$$

$$\frac{e \mapsto e'}{\text{left}(e) \mapsto \text{left}(e')} \quad \frac{e \mapsto e'}{\text{right}(e) \mapsto \text{right}(e')}$$

$$\frac{e \mapsto e'}{\text{case } e \text{ of } \{\text{left}(x) \Rightarrow e_1 ; \text{right}(y) \Rightarrow e_2\} \mapsto \text{case } e' \text{ of } \{\text{left}(x) \Rightarrow e_1 ; \text{right}(y) \Rightarrow e_2\}}$$

$$\frac{}{\text{case left}(v) \text{ of } \{\text{left}(x) \Rightarrow e_1 ; \text{right}(y) \Rightarrow e_2\} \mapsto e_1[v/x]}$$

$$\frac{}{\text{case right}(v) \text{ of } \{\text{left}(x) \Rightarrow e_1 ; \text{right}(y) \Rightarrow e_2\} \mapsto e_2[v/y]}$$

One example of a design choice is whether to evaluate the subexpressions of a pair left-to-right, or right-to-left (or not specify the order, or not evaluate them eagerly at all...)

(b) i. The step derivations are:

$$\overline{(\lambda p. (\text{snd } p, \text{fst } p + 2)) (17, 42) \mapsto (\text{snd } (17, 42), \text{fst } (17, 42) + 2)}$$

$$\frac{\overline{\text{snd } (17, 42) \mapsto 42}}{(\text{snd } (17, 42), \text{fst } (17, 42) + 2) \mapsto (42, \text{fst } (17, 42) + 2)}$$

$$\frac{\overline{\text{fst } (17, 42) \mapsto 17} \quad \overline{\text{fst } (17, 42) + 2 \mapsto 17 + 2}}{(42, \text{fst } (17, 42) + 2) \mapsto (42, 17 + 2)}$$

$$\overline{(42, 17 + 2) \mapsto (42, 19)}$$

ii. The step derivations are:

$$\overline{(\lambda x. \text{case } x \text{ of } \{\text{left}(y). y + 1 ; \text{right}(z). z\}) (\text{left}(42)) \mapsto \text{case left}(42) \text{ of } \{\text{left}(y). y + 1 ; \text{right}(z). z\}}$$

$$\overline{\text{case left}(42) \text{ of } \{\text{left}(y). y + 1 ; \text{right}(z). z\} \mapsto 42 + 1}$$

$$\overline{42 + 1 \mapsto 43}$$

5. (*) Type soundness for nondeterminism

- (a) Preservation means that if $\vdash e : \tau$ holds and $e \mapsto e'$ then $\vdash e' : \tau$ holds.

To prove preservation, suppose we have a well-formed nondeterministic choice expression:

$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash e_1 : \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash e_2 : \tau}{\Gamma \vdash e_1 \square e_2 : \tau}$$

such that $e_1 \square e_2 \mapsto e'$.

There are two cases. If $e_1 \square e_2 \mapsto e_1$ then we know $\vdash e_1 : \tau$ by assumption. Similarly, if $e_1 \square e_2 \mapsto e_2$ then we know $\vdash e_2 : \tau$.

- (b) Progress means that if $\vdash e : \tau$ holds then either e is a value, or e can take a step ($e \mapsto e'$).

To prove progress for a nondeterministic expression $\vdash e_1 \square e_2 : \tau$, this is immediate since such an expression can definitely step to e_1 (or e_2). Note that progress does not require that the step taken is unique; indeed, type soundness can hold for a nondeterministic language as long as both alternatives in a choice expression have the same type.