CSCI 3155 LAB 3 WRITEUP

Lubrano, Jason & Abiel Fattore February 24, 2018

1 FEEDBACK

2 Question 2

Problem a). Hi my name is Jason Lubrano and I'm Abiel Fattore and this is our lab writeup.

```
/* jason lubrano and abiel fattore's jsy tests
       ->> notes are for STATIC */
const x = 5
       // make x = 5
const y = function(x) { return x }
       /* wouldnt get replaced in static,
   replaced by whatever gets passed */
const z = function(a) { return x }
       /* would get replaced in static */
const foo = fucntion(boo) { return y(boo) + z(boo) }
       /* y(boo) returns 10, z(boo) returns 5
           foo(10) = 15 */
jsy.print(a) /* prints 5 */
jsy.print(y(3)) /* prints 3 */
jsy.print(z(4)) /* prints 5 */
```

This test is one of the many test cases we wrote for our program. It is simple, yet defines the biggest difference between (and issues that may arise) from static and dynamic scoping. In **dynamic scoping**, the environment would be updated such that every x would be equal to 5. This is unfortunate because no matter what we pass through our functions y and z, we will always print 5 because they want to return x.

Static scoping is what is seen in most languages such as C++ and Java. Even though we have $const \ x = 5$ written, function y will return whatever the parameter is equal to.

Then we have the function foo. In dynamic scoping: foo would return 10; however in static scoping foo would return 15 because: the y function would return 10, the z function would return 5, so 15.

Problem b). Done.

3 Question 3

Problem d). Determinism is shown in small step semantics by its inference rules. For example, when adding two expressions, e_1 , e_2 , the program has three steps. First it must evaluate the first expression, e_1 to a value. Next, the program must evaluate the second

expression e_2 to a value. Lastly, it must do the addition. This inference rule shows that order matters and thus shows evaluation order is deterministic. In big step semantics, the inference rules don't specify any order when evaluating an expression saying that evaluation order is arbitrary, (or doesn't matter) so this doesn't show determinism.

4 Question 4

Problem T. he evaluation order for $e_1 + e_2$ starts form the left and works to the right. The inference rule for binary plus in small step semantics enforces this by making it so that expression e_2 can't be evaluated until e_1 has been evaluated to some value. To obtain the opposite evaluation order, you would make it so expression e_1 can't be evaluated until e_2 has been evaluated to some value. This would be done in the SearchBinary1 inference rule.

5 Question 5

Problem a). Example: $e_1||e_2$. This example uses short-circuit evaluation by checking if e_1 is true, then returns true if so. The second expression, e_2 won't be evaluated which would save time in the long run. Short-circuiting still stays true to the logical or operation.

Consider the truth table:

 e_1 e_2 returned

T T T

T F T

F T T

F F F

For the first two expressions, since e_1 is true, it doesn't matter whats the value of e_2 because true will be returned irregardless. For the third and fourth expression, e_1 gets evaluated to false, so it relies on e_2 's value for the return. In each case, e_2 gets evaluated.

Problem b). The figures are logical and says that if both expression aren't true the false is returned. The expression: e1 && e2 uses short circuiting because if first expression is true then, the second expression will be returned. If the second expression was true then the returned value would be true. Otherwise, the returned value would be false. An evaluation step is skipped.

Consider the truth table:

 e_1 e_2 returned

T T T

T F F

F T F

F F F

For the last two expressions, since e_1 is false, it doesn't matter whats the value of e_2 because false will be returned irregardless. For the first and second expression, e_1 gets evaluated to true, so it relies on e_2 's value for the return. In each case, e_2 gets evaluated.