

CST IB Semantics of Programming Languages  
2002, Paper 5, question 9

(a)

$$(1) \frac{}{\langle s, n \rangle \Downarrow \langle s, n \rangle}$$

$$(2) \frac{x \in \text{dom}(s) \ \& \ s(x) = n}{\langle s, x \rangle \Downarrow \langle s, n \rangle}$$

$$(3) \frac{x \in \text{dom}(s) \ \& \ s(x) = n}{\langle s, x++ \rangle \Downarrow \langle s[x \mapsto n+1], n \rangle}$$

(where  $s[x \mapsto n+1]$  maps  $x$  to  $n+1$  & otherwise acts like  $s$ )

$$(4) \frac{x \in \text{dom}(s) \ \& \ s(x) = n}{\langle s, ++x \rangle \Downarrow \langle s[x \mapsto n+1], n+1 \rangle}$$

$$(5) \frac{\begin{cases} \langle s, e_1 \rangle \Downarrow \langle s', n_1 \rangle \\ \langle s', e_2 \rangle \Downarrow \langle s'', n_2 \rangle \\ n = n_1 + n_2 \end{cases}}{\langle s, e_1 + e_2 \rangle \Downarrow \langle s'', n \rangle}$$

(b)

$$(6) \frac{\langle s, e \rangle \Downarrow \langle s, n \rangle}{\langle s, x = e \rangle \Downarrow s[x \mapsto n]}$$

$$(7) \frac{\begin{cases} \langle s, e \rangle \Downarrow \langle s', n' \rangle \\ x \in \text{dom}(s') \ \& \ s'(x) = n' \\ n'' = n' + n \end{cases}}{\langle s, x += e \rangle \Downarrow s'[x \mapsto n'']}$$

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \langle S, c_1 \rangle \Downarrow s' \\
 (8) \quad \frac{\langle S', c_2 \rangle \Downarrow s''}{\langle S, c_1; c_2 \rangle \Downarrow s''}
 \end{array}$$

(c)

Expressions  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are semantically equivalent, written  $e_1 \approx e_2$ , if & only if for all states  $s, s'$  and all integers  $n$

$$\langle s, e_1 \rangle \Downarrow \langle s', n \rangle \text{ iff } \langle s, e_2 \rangle \Downarrow \langle s', n \rangle$$

Commands  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  are semantically equivalent, written  $c_1 \approx c_2$ , if & only if for all states  $s, s'$

$$\langle s, c_1 \rangle \Downarrow s' \text{ iff } \langle s, c_2 \rangle \Downarrow s'$$

(d)

(i) Yes,  $++x \approx x++ + 1$ .

Proof: if

$$(9) \quad \langle s, ++x \rangle \Downarrow \langle s', n' \rangle$$

then this must have been proved by applying rule (4), so

$$x \in \text{dom}(s), s(x) = n \text{ say,}$$

$$s' = s[x \mapsto n+1], \text{ and } n' = n+1.$$

Then by rule (3),  $\langle s, x++ \rangle \Downarrow \langle s', n \rangle$ , so by rules (1) and (5) we have

$$(10) \quad \langle S, x++ + 1 \rangle \Downarrow \langle S', n' \rangle.$$

Conversely if (10) holds, it must have been deduced by applying rule (S) to

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} (11) \quad \langle S, x++ \rangle \Downarrow \langle S_1, n_1 \rangle \\ (12) \quad \langle S_1, 1 \rangle \Downarrow \langle S', n_2 \rangle \end{array} \right\} \text{ for some } S_1, n_1, n_2$$

with  $n_1 + n_2 = n'$ . Now (11) (resp. (12)) must have been deduced from (3) (resp. (1)),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{So} \quad & x \in \text{dom}(S) \\ & n_1 = S(x) \\ & S_1 = S[x \mapsto n_1 + 1] \\ & n_2 = 1 \text{ \& } S' = S_1 \end{aligned}$$

and hence  $n' = n_1 + n_2 = n_1 + 1$ . Hence by rule (4), (9) holds.

② Thus (9)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (10) for all  $S, S', n'$ : hence  $++x \approx x++ + 1$ .

1 (ii) No,  $(x = ++x) \not\approx (x = x++)$ .

For example

$$\langle [x \mapsto 0], x = ++x \rangle \Downarrow [x \mapsto 1]$$

whereas

$$\langle [x \mapsto 0], x = x++ \rangle \Downarrow [x \mapsto 0].$$

②

1 (iii) Yes,  $(x = ++x) \approx (x += 1)$ .

Proof: if

$$(13) \quad \langle S, x = ++x \rangle \Downarrow S'$$

then this was deduced from (4) & then (6), so  
 $x \in \text{dom}(S)$ ,  $S(x) = n$  say, and  $S' = S[x \mapsto n+1]$ .  
 Hence by (1) & (7)

$$(14) \quad \langle S, x += 1 \rangle \Downarrow S'$$

Conversely, if (14) holds, it was deduced from  
 (1) & (7) and then by (4) & (6), (13) holds.

② Thus (13)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (14) for all  $S, S'$ : so  $(x = ++x) \approx (x += 1)$ .

1 (iv) No, in general  $(x += e) \not\approx (x = x + e)$ .

For example, take  $e = x++$ . Then

$$1 \quad \langle [x \mapsto 0], x += e \rangle \Downarrow [x \mapsto 1]$$

whereas

$$② \quad \langle [x \mapsto 0], x = x + e \rangle \Downarrow [x \mapsto 0].$$

To which parts of the lecture course does this question refer?

---

Parts (a) & (b) require a knowledge of lectures 3 & 4, but are not exactly the same as any example given there.

Part (c) is a definition from Lecture 5 (applied to this unfamiliar language)

Part (d) requires problem-solving ability based on experience gained from lectures 5 & 6.