

Here's some shitty-first draft bad opsem. My goal for today is to make good opsem.

My questions are:

Do we want opsem to formally notate the evaluation of e with the new bindings?

I'm putting the verse rules on top to represent how they create no bindings as well. How kosher is this?

I assume we need to prove Verse-if true e e is e and creates no new bindings to logical variables in its scope. Am I right about this?

Introduce an abstract machine semantics? uscheme in chapter 3.

First, talk about syntactic forms and forms of judgement.

1 for verse, one for PM.

Forms of judgement

First, the base translation:

Translation from P to V -style if-then-else:

$$\frac{\text{case } v \text{ of } _ \rightarrow e}{\text{if (True) } e \text{ } e}$$

TODO FIX if true e e to if true e impossible

$$\text{VERSE-IFTRUEBINDINGS} \frac{}{\text{VERSE-IF(True } e \text{ } e) \mapsto \{\}}$$

$$\text{VERSE-IFTRUEEVAL} \frac{}{\text{VERSE-IF(True } e \text{ } e) \mapsto e}$$

Maybe want these as VERSE-IFLITERALBINDINGS?

$$\text{TRANSLATEWILDCARDBINDINGS} \frac{\text{VERSE-IF(True } e \text{ } e) \mapsto \{\}}{\text{CASE(WILDCARD, } v) \mapsto \{\}}$$

$$\text{TRANSLATEWILDCARDEVAL} \frac{}{\text{CASE}(\text{WILDCARD}, v, e) \mapsto \text{VERSE-IF}(\text{True } e \ e)}$$

$$\text{TRANSLATEWILDCARDEVAL}' \frac{\text{VERSE-IF}(\text{True } e \ e) \mapsto e}{\text{CASE}(\text{WILDCARD}, v, e) \mapsto e}$$

Moving on to variables:

$$\frac{\text{case } v \text{ of } x \rightarrow e}{\text{if } (\exists x. x = v) \text{ e } e}$$

$$\text{VERSE-IFBINDINGS} \frac{}{\text{VERSE-IF}((\exists x. x = v) \ e \ e) \mapsto e\{x \mapsto v\}}$$

$$\text{VERSE-IFEVAL} \frac{}{\text{VERSE-IF}(\text{True } e \ e) \mapsto e}$$

$$\text{TRANSLATEVARBINDINGS} \frac{\text{VERSE-IF}((\exists x. x = v) \ e \ e) \mapsto \{x \mapsto v\}}{\text{CASE}(x, v, e) \mapsto \{x \mapsto v\}}$$

$$\text{TRANSLATEVAREVAL} \frac{\text{VERSE-IF}((\exists x. x = v) \ e \ e) \mapsto e\{x \mapsto v\}}{\text{CASE}(x, v, e) \mapsto e\{x \mapsto v\}}$$