

Harvard School of Engineering and Applied Sciences — CS 152: Programming Languages  
Induction; Small-step operational semantics; Large-step operational semantics  
Section and Practice Problems

Week 3

---

## 1 Induction

Let's inductively define a set of integers **Quux** with the following inference rules.

$$\text{RULE1} \frac{}{8 \in \mathbf{Quux}} \quad \text{RULE2} \frac{}{5 \in \mathbf{Quux}} \quad \text{RULE3} \frac{a \in \mathbf{Quux} \quad b \in \mathbf{Quux}}{c = a + b + 1} c \in \mathbf{Quux}$$

- Of the rules above (i.e., RULE1, RULE2, and RULE3), which are axioms and which are inductive rules?
- Give a derivation showing that 11 is in the set **Quux**.
- Give a derivation showing that 20 is in the set **Quux**.
- Write down the inductive reasoning principle for **Quux**. That is, if you wanted to prove that for some property  $P$ , for all  $a \in \mathbf{Quux}$  we have  $P(a)$ , what would you need to show? (See Lecture 3 §2.2 and §2.3.)
- Prove that for all  $a \in \mathbf{Quux}$ , there exists  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $a = 3 \times i - 1$ .  
Make sure that you follow the Recipe for Inductive Proofs! See Lecture 3 §2.5. What set are you inducting on? What is the property you are trying to prove? Go through each case.
- Is 2 in the set **Quux**? If so, give a derivation proving it.

## 2 Small-step operational semantics

Consider the small-step operational semantics for the language of arithmetic expressions (Lecture 2). Let  $\sigma_0$  be a store that maps all program variables to zero.

- Show a derivation that  $\langle 3 + (5 \times \text{bar}), \sigma_0 \rangle \longrightarrow \langle 3 + (5 \times 0), \sigma_0 \rangle$ .
- What is the sequence of configurations that  $\langle \text{foo} := 5; (\text{foo} + 2) \times 7, \sigma_0 \rangle$  steps to? (You don't need to show the derivations for each step, just show what configuration  $\langle \text{foo} := 5; (\text{foo} + 2) \times 7, \sigma_0 \rangle$  steps to in one step, then two steps, then three steps, and so on, until you reach a final configuration.)
- Find an integer  $n$  and store  $\sigma'$  such that  $\langle ((6 + (\text{foo} := (\text{bar} := 3; 5); 1 + \text{bar})) + \text{bar}) \times \text{foo}, \sigma_0 \rangle \longrightarrow^* \langle n, \sigma' \rangle$ .
- Is the relation  $\longrightarrow$  reflexive? Is it symmetric? Is it anti-symmetric? Is it transitive?  
(For each of these questions, if the answer is "no", what is a suitable counterexample? If any of the answers are "yes", think about how you would prove it.)

## 3 Large-step operational semantics

Consider the large-step operational semantics for the language of arithmetic expressions (Lecture 4). Let  $\sigma_0$  be a store that maps all program variables to zero.

- Show a derivation that  $\langle 3 + (5 \times \text{bar}), \sigma_0 \rangle \Downarrow \langle 3, \sigma_0 \rangle$ .

(b) Find an integer  $n$  and store  $\sigma'$  such that  $\langle \text{foo} := 5; (\text{foo} + 2) \times 7, \sigma_0 \rangle \Downarrow \langle n, \sigma' \rangle$ .

If you have time and a big piece of paper, give the derivation of  $\langle \text{foo} := 5; (\text{foo} + 2) \times 7, \sigma_0 \rangle \Downarrow \langle n, \sigma' \rangle$ .

(c) Is the relation  $\Downarrow$  reflexive? Is it symmetric? Is it anti-symmetric? Is it transitive?

(For each of these questions, if the answer is “no”, what is a suitable counterexample? If any of the answers are “yes”, think about how you would prove it.)