IMP: a simple imperative language CS 1520 (Spring 2025)

Harvard University

Tuesday, February 11, 2025

Today, we learn to

- define operational semantics for a simple imperative language
- prove equivalence between commands
- perform arguments on proof trees
- perform induction over derivation without counterpart over structure



arithmetic expressions

$$a \in \mathbf{Aexp}$$



 $b \in \mathbf{Bexp}$



 $c \in \mathbf{Com}$

IMP syntax

$$a ::= x | n | a_1 + a_2 | a_1 \times a_2$$

 $b ::= true | false | a_1 < a_2$

$$c ::= \mathbf{skip} \mid x := a \mid c_1; c_2$$
$$\mid \mathbf{if} \ b \ \mathbf{then} \ c_1 \ \mathbf{else} \ c_2$$
$$\mid \mathbf{while} \ b \ \mathbf{do} \ c$$

configurations of the form:

configurations of the form:

 \blacktriangleright < a, σ >

configurations of the form:

< a, σ >
 < b, σ >

configurations of the form:

< a, σ >
 < b, σ >
 < c, σ >

configurations of the form:



final configurations of the form:

configurations of the form:



▶ final configurations of the form:

 \blacktriangleright < n, σ >

configurations of the form:



final configurations of the form:

$$\blacktriangleright$$
 < n, σ >

 \blacktriangleright < true, σ >, < false, σ >

configurations of the form:

- < a, σ >
 < b, σ >
 < c, σ >
- final configurations of the form:
 - \blacktriangleright < n, σ >
 - \blacktriangleright < true, σ >, < false, σ >
 - \blacktriangleright < skip, σ >

$$\longrightarrow_{\mathsf{Aexp}} \subseteq ?$$

$$\longrightarrow_{\mathsf{Bexp}} \subseteq ?$$

$$\longrightarrow_{\mathsf{Com}} \subseteq ?$$

 $\longrightarrow_{\mathsf{Aexp}} \subseteq \mathsf{Aexp} \times \mathsf{Store} \times \mathsf{Aexp} \times \mathsf{Store} \\ \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{Bexp}} \subseteq \mathsf{Bexp} \times \mathsf{Store} \times \mathsf{Bexp} \times \mathsf{Store} \\ \longrightarrow_{\mathsf{Com}} \subseteq \mathsf{Com} \times \mathsf{Store} \times \mathsf{Com} \times \mathsf{Store}$

 $\longrightarrow_{\mathsf{Aexp}} \subseteq (\mathsf{Aexp} \times \mathsf{Store}) \times (\mathsf{Aexp} \times \mathsf{Store})$ $\longrightarrow_{\mathsf{Bexp}} \subseteq (\mathsf{Bexp} \times \mathsf{Store}) \times (\mathsf{Bexp} \times \mathsf{Store})$ $\longrightarrow_{\mathsf{Com}} \subseteq (\mathsf{Com} \times \mathsf{Store}) \times (\mathsf{Com} \times \mathsf{Store})$

 $\begin{array}{l} (\textbf{Aexp} \times \textbf{Store}) \longrightarrow_{\textbf{Aexp}} (\textbf{Aexp} \times \textbf{Store}) \\ (\textbf{Bexp} \times \textbf{Store}) \longrightarrow_{\textbf{Bexp}} (\textbf{Bexp} \times \textbf{Store}) \\ (\textbf{Com} \times \textbf{Store}) \longrightarrow_{\textbf{Com}} (\textbf{Com} \times \textbf{Store}) \end{array}$

Arithmetic expressions (1/2)

$$\overline{\langle x, \sigma \rangle \longrightarrow \langle n, \sigma \rangle} \text{ where } n = \sigma(x)$$

$$\frac{\langle a_1, \sigma \rangle \longrightarrow \langle a'_1, \sigma \rangle}{\langle a_1 + a_2, \sigma \rangle \longrightarrow \langle a'_1 + a_2, \sigma \rangle}$$

$$\frac{\langle a_2, \sigma \rangle \longrightarrow \langle a'_2, \sigma \rangle}{\langle n + a_2, \sigma \rangle \longrightarrow \langle n + a'_2, \sigma \rangle}$$

$$\overline{\langle n + m, \sigma \rangle \longrightarrow \langle p, \sigma \rangle} \text{ where } p = n + m$$

Arithmetic expressions (2/2)

$$\begin{array}{c} \longrightarrow < a'_1, \sigma > \\ \hline \longrightarrow < a'_1 \times a_2, \sigma > \\ \hline \longrightarrow < a'_2, \sigma > \\ \hline \longrightarrow < n \times a'_2, \sigma > \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \end{array}$$

< *n* \times *m*, σ > \longrightarrow < *p*, σ >

Boolean expressions

 $< a_1, \sigma > \longrightarrow < a'_1, \sigma >$ $\langle a_1 \langle a_2, \sigma \rangle \longrightarrow \langle a'_1 \langle a_2, \sigma \rangle$ $\langle a_2, \sigma \rangle \longrightarrow \langle a'_2, \sigma \rangle$ $< n < a_2, \sigma > \longrightarrow < n < a'_2, \sigma >$

 $< n < m, \sigma > \longrightarrow <$ true, $\sigma >$ where n < m

< *n* < *m*, σ > \longrightarrow < false, σ > where *n* ≥ *m*

Commands (1/3)

$$\frac{\langle a, \sigma \rangle \longrightarrow \langle a', \sigma \rangle}{\langle x := a, \sigma \rangle \longrightarrow \langle x := a', \sigma \rangle}$$

$$< x := n, \sigma > \longrightarrow < \mathbf{skip}, \sigma[x \mapsto n] >$$

$$\frac{\langle c_1, \sigma \rangle \longrightarrow \langle c'_1, \sigma' \rangle}{\langle c_1; c_2, \sigma \rangle \longrightarrow \langle c'_1; c_2, \sigma' \rangle}$$

< skip; $c_2, \sigma > \longrightarrow < c_2, \sigma >$

Commands (2/3)

 $< b, \sigma > \longrightarrow < b', \sigma >$

< if *b* then c_1 else $c_2, \sigma > \longrightarrow$ < if *b*' then c_1 else $c_2, \sigma >$

< if true then c_1 else $c_2, \sigma > \longrightarrow < c_1, \sigma >$

< if false then c_1 else $c_2, \sigma > \longrightarrow < c_2, \sigma >$



< while *b* do *c*, $\sigma > \rightarrow$ < if *b* then (*c*; while *b* do *c*) else skip, $\sigma >$

Small-step execution

< foo := 3; while foo < 4 do foo := foo + 5, $\sigma >$ \rightarrow < skip; while foo < 4 do foo := foo + 5, σ' > where $\sigma' = \sigma$ [foo \mapsto 3] \rightarrow < while foo < 4 do foo := foo + 5, σ' > \rightarrow < if foo < 4 then (foo := foo + 5; W) else skip, σ' > \rightarrow < if 3 < 4 then (foo := foo + 5; W) else skip, σ' > \rightarrow < if true then (foo := foo + 5; W) else skip, σ' > \longrightarrow < foo := foo + 5; while foo < 4 do foo := foo + 5. σ' > \rightarrow < foo := 3 + 5: while foo < 4 do foo := foo + 5. σ' > \rightarrow < foo := 8; while foo < 4 do foo := foo + 5, σ' > \rightarrow < skip; while foo < 4 do foo := foo + 5, σ'' > where $\sigma'' = \sigma'[\mathsf{foo} \mapsto 8]$ \rightarrow < while foo < 4 do foo := foo + 5, σ'' > \rightarrow < if foo < 4 then (foo := foo + 5; W) else skip, σ'' > \rightarrow < if 8 < 4 then (foo := foo + 5; W) else skip, σ'' > \rightarrow < if false then (foo := foo + 5; W) else skip, σ'' > $\rightarrow < \text{skip}, \sigma'' >$

(where W is an abbreviation for the while loop while foo < 4 do foo := foo + 5).

$$\Downarrow_{\mathsf{Aexp}} \subseteq ?$$

$$\Downarrow_{\mathsf{Bexp}} \subseteq ?$$

$$\Downarrow_{\mathsf{Com}} \subseteq ?$$

$\Downarrow_{\mathsf{Aexp}} \subseteq \mathsf{Aexp} \times \mathsf{Store} \times \mathsf{Int}$

$\Downarrow_{\mathsf{Bexp}} \subseteq \mathsf{Bexp} \times \mathsf{Store} \times \mathsf{Bool}$

$\Downarrow_{\mathsf{Com}} \subseteq \mathsf{Com} \times \mathsf{Store} \times \mathsf{Store}$

$$\begin{split} & \Downarrow_{\mathsf{Aexp}} \subseteq (\mathsf{Aexp} \times \mathsf{Store}) \times \mathsf{Int} \\ & \Downarrow_{\mathsf{Bexp}} \subseteq (\mathsf{Bexp} \times \mathsf{Store}) \times \mathsf{Bool} \\ & \Downarrow_{\mathsf{Com}} \subseteq (\mathsf{Com} \times \mathsf{Store}) \times \mathsf{Store} \end{split}$$

$(Aexp \times Store) \Downarrow_{Aexp} Int$

$(\mathsf{Bexp}\times\mathsf{Store})\Downarrow_{\mathsf{Bexp}}\mathsf{Bool}$

 $(\textbf{Com} \times \textbf{Store}) \Downarrow_{\textbf{Com}} \textbf{Store}$

Arithmetic expressions

$$\overline{\langle n, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow n}$$
 $\overline{\langle x, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow n}$ where $\sigma(x) = n$

$$\frac{\langle a_1, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow n_1 \langle a_2, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow n_2}{\langle a_1 + a_2, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow n} \text{ where } n = n_1 + n_2$$

$$\frac{\langle a_1, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow n_1 \langle a_2, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow n_2}{\langle a_1 \times a_2, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow n} \text{ where } n = n_1 \times n_2$$

Boolean expressions

$$<\mathsf{true},\sigma>\Downarrow\mathsf{true}\qquad <\mathsf{false},\sigma>\Downarrow\mathsf{false}$$

$$\frac{\langle a_1, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow n_1 \langle a_2, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow n_2}{\langle a_1 \langle a_2, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \mathbf{true}} \text{ where } n_1 \langle n_2 \rangle \\ \frac{\langle a_1, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow n_1 \langle a_2, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \mathbf{true}}{\langle a_1, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow n_1 \langle a_2, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \mathbf{n_2}} \text{ where } n_1 \geq n_2$$

Commands (1/2)

$$\frac{\text{SKIP}}{|\langle \mathbf{skip}, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma|} \\ \text{ASG} \frac{\langle \mathbf{a}, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \mathbf{n}}{|\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \Rightarrow \| \sigma[\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{n}]|} \\ \text{SEQ} \frac{\langle \mathbf{c}_1, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma' \langle \mathbf{c}_2, \sigma' \rangle \Downarrow \sigma''}{\langle \mathbf{c}_1; \mathbf{c}_2, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma''}$$

IF-T
$$< b, \sigma > \Downarrow$$
 true $< c_1, \sigma > \Downarrow \sigma'$
 $<$ if *b* then c_1 else $c_2, \sigma > \Downarrow \sigma'$
IF-F $< b, \sigma > \Downarrow$ false $< c_2, \sigma > \Downarrow \sigma'$
 $<$ if *b* then c_1 else $c_2, \sigma > \Downarrow \sigma'$

Commands (2/2)

$$\text{WHILE-T} \frac{\langle b, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \text{ true } \langle c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma'}{\langle \text{ while } b \text{ do } c, \sigma' \rangle \Downarrow \sigma''}$$

Command equivalence

The small-step operational semantics suggest that the loop **while** b **do** c should be equivalent to the command **if** b **then** (c; **while** b **do** c) **else skip**. Can we show that this indeed the case when the language is defined using the above large-step evaluation?

Equivalence of commands

Two commands c and c' are equivalent written $c \sim c'$ if, for any stores σ and σ' , we have

 $< \mathbf{c}, \sigma > \Downarrow \sigma' \iff < \mathbf{c}', \sigma > \Downarrow \sigma'.$



For all $b \in \mathbf{Bexp}$ and $c \in \mathbf{Com}$ we have

while b do c

 \sim

if b then (c; while b do c) else skip

Proof

Let W be an abbreviation for **while** b **do** c. We want to show that for all stores σ, σ' , we have:

 $< W, \sigma > \Downarrow \sigma' \iff < \mathsf{if} \ b \mathsf{then} \ (c; W) \mathsf{else skip}, \sigma > \Downarrow \sigma'$

For this, we must show that both directions (\implies and \Leftarrow) hold. We'll show only direction \implies ; the other is similar.

Assume that σ and σ' are stores such that $\langle W, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma'$. It means that there is some derivation that proves for this fact. Inspecting the evaluation rules, we see that there are two possible rules whose conclusions match this fact: WHILE-F and WHILE-T. We analyze each of them in turn.

Case WHILE-F (1/2)

The derivation must look like the following.

WHILE-F
$$\frac{\overset{:^{1}}{\hline < b, \sigma > \Downarrow \text{ false}}}{< W, \sigma > \Downarrow \sigma}$$

Here, we use \mathbb{P}^1 to refer to the derivation of $< b, \sigma > \Downarrow$ false. Note that in this case, $\sigma' = \sigma$.

We can use $:^1$ to derive a proof tree showing that the evaluation of **if** b **then** (c; W) **else skip** yields the same final state σ :

$$\operatorname{IF-F} \underbrace{\frac{\vdots^{1}}{\langle b, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \text{ false}}}_{\langle \text{ if } b \text{ then } (c; W) \text{ else skip}, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma}^{\operatorname{SKIP}}$$

Case WHILE-T (1/2)

In this case, the derivation has the following form.



Case WHILE-T (2/2)

We can use subderivations $:^2$, $:^3$, and $:^4$ to show that the evaluation of **if** b **then** (c; W) **else skip** yields the same final state σ .



Break

• Add \wedge to boolean expressions.

- Contrast the design of While in small-step and large-step. Can one style be used for the other? Can you mix small-step and large-step?
- How do you prove that while true do skip never terminates? In small-step? In large-step?
- Define and sketch proof for large-step determinism of commands.

\wedge extending grammar

$$b ::= \dots \mid b_1 \wedge b_2$$

 $t ::=$ true \mid false

\land extending large-step semantics

$$\frac{\langle b_1, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow t_1 \langle b_2, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow t_2}{\langle b_1 \land b_2, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow t_3}$$

where t_3 is **true**
if t_1 and t_2 are **true**,
and **false** otherwise

∧ extending large-step semantics (alternative left-first-sequential)

> $< b_1, \sigma > \Downarrow$ false $< b_1 \land b_2, \sigma > \Downarrow$ false

$$egin{aligned} < b_1, \sigma > \Downarrow ext{ true } & < b_2, \sigma > \Downarrow ext{ false } \ & < b_1 \wedge b_2, \sigma > \Downarrow ext{ false } \end{aligned}$$

Alternative large-step rule for While

$\frac{<\mathsf{if}\ b\ \mathsf{then}\ (c;\mathsf{while}\ b\ \mathsf{do}\ c)\ \mathsf{else}\ \mathsf{skip},\sigma>\Downarrow\ \sigma'}{<\mathsf{while}\ b\ \mathsf{do}\ c,\sigma>\Downarrow\ \sigma'}$

Determinism

For all commands $c \in \mathbf{Com}$ and stores $\sigma, \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathbf{Store}$, if $\langle c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma_1$ and $\langle c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma_2$ then $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$.

Proof Sketch for Determinism

By induction on the derivation of $\langle c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma_1$. The inductive hypothesis *P* is

$$P(\langle c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma_1) = \forall \sigma_2 \in \mathbf{Store},$$

if $\langle c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma_2$ then $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$.

We have a derivation for $\langle c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma_1$, for some c, σ , and σ_1 . Assume that the inductive hypothesis holds for any subderivation $\langle c', \sigma' \rangle \Downarrow \sigma''$ used in the derivation of $\langle c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma_1$. Assume that for some σ_2 we have $\langle c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma_2$.

We need to show that $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$.

Case IF-T (1/2)

:

and we have $c \equiv \mathbf{if} \ b \ \mathbf{then} \ c_1 \ \mathbf{else} \ c_2$. The last rule used in the derivation of $\langle c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma_2$ must be either IF-T or IF-F (since these are the only rules that can be used to derive a conclusion of the form $\langle \mathbf{if} \ b \ \mathbf{then} \ c_1 \ \mathbf{else} \ c_2, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma_2$). But by the determinism of boolean expressions, we must have $\langle b, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \mathbf{true}$, and so the derivation of $\langle c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma_2$ must have the following form...

Case IF-T (2/2)

IF-T
$$(c_1, \sigma > \Downarrow \sigma_2) = (c_1, \sigma > \sqcup \sigma_2)$$

:

:

The result holds by the inductive hypothesis applied it to the derivation $\overline{\langle c_1, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma_1}$.



and we have $c \equiv$ while *b* do c_1 . The last rule used in the derivation of $\langle c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma_2$ must also be WHILE-T (by the determinism of boolean expressions), and so we have...



Case WHILE-T (3/3)

By another application of the inductive hypothesis, : to the derivation $\overline{\langle c, \sigma' \rangle \Downarrow \sigma_1}$, we have $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$ and the result holds.

Comment on Case $\operatorname{WHILE-T}$

Even though the command $c \equiv$ while b do c_1 appears in the derivation of < while b do $c_1, \sigma > \Downarrow \sigma_1$, we do not run in to problems, as the induction is over the *derivation*, not over the structure of the command.