

#### ④ Formal properties of the operational semantics:

(i)  $\gamma \rightarrow \gamma_1$  and  $\gamma \rightarrow \gamma_2 \Rightarrow \gamma_1 = \gamma_2$ .

The semantics is deterministic.

(ii)  $\forall \gamma \in \Gamma_N. \exists \gamma' \text{ s.t. } \gamma \rightarrow \gamma'$ .

In this semantics, executions never get stuck.

(iii) From (i) and (ii) it follows that for every  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , there exists a unique maximal sequence.

$$\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n$$

↑  
may be infinite.

Such that

$$\gamma = \gamma_0 \wedge \gamma_0 \rightarrow \gamma_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \gamma_n$$

$\wedge \gamma_n$  is a terminal configuration or  $n$  is infinite.

This maximal finite or infinite sequence represents the full computation starting from  $\gamma$ .

(iv) We write  $\gamma \vdash$  if the maximal execution sequence from  $\gamma$  is infinite. ~~We write~~  $\neq$  Then, for all commands  $c$  and states  $b$ ,

$$\llbracket c \rrbracket b = \perp \quad \text{iff} \quad \langle c, b \rangle \vdash$$

$$\llbracket c \rrbracket b = b' \quad \text{iff} \quad \langle c, b \rangle \xrightarrow{*} b'$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\uparrow \\ &\left( \begin{array}{l} \text{reflexive and transitive} \\ \text{closure of } \rightarrow, \text{ i.e.} \\ * \text{ def. } \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} (\rightarrow)^n \end{array} \right) \end{aligned}$$

exercise. Prove (i), (ii) and (iv).

exercise. Explain why (iii) is true.  
the reasoning in

#### 4. Extension with newvar.

① Extend the ~~language~~ language with variable declaration:

$$\langle \text{comm} \rangle ::= \dots \mid \text{newvar } \langle \text{var} \rangle := \langle \text{intexp} \rangle \text{ in } \langle \text{comm} \rangle.$$

② ~~What is~~ How should we modify the  $\rightarrow$  relation? Add a rule for newvar.

(i) Option 1.

$$\langle \text{newvar } v := e \text{ in } c, b \rangle \rightarrow \langle c; v := en, [b|v: \llbracket e \rrbracket b] \rangle$$

$$\text{where } n = b(v).$$

(ii) Option 2.

$$\langle c, [b|v: \llbracket e \rrbracket b] \rangle \rightarrow \langle c', b' \rangle$$

$$\langle \text{newvar } v := e \text{ in } c, b \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{newvar } v := b'(v) \text{ in } c', [b'|v: b(v)] \rangle$$

$$\langle c, [b|v: \llbracket e \rrbracket b] \rangle \rightarrow b'$$

$$\langle \text{newvar } v := e \text{ in } c, b \rangle \rightarrow [b'|v: b(v)]$$

(iii) Both options are acceptable. But (ii) is better. Only (ii) works when we extend the language with primitives for concurrent executions.

③ Note that we did not change  $\Gamma_N, \Gamma_T$ . Thus, adding newvar doesn't change the operational semantics much. In a sense, this small change means that newvar doesn't change the language much, either.

#### 5. Adding fail.

$$\langle \text{comm} \rangle ::= \dots \mid \text{fail}.$$

① When we add fail, we have to change the set  $\Gamma_T$  of terminal configuration, because we now have two types of terminations, normal one and abnormal one.

$$\Gamma_T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \hat{\Sigma} = \Sigma \cup \{\text{abort}\} \times \Sigma. \quad (\text{or } = \Sigma + \Sigma)$$