Looking back, looking forward

This is the last lecture using IMP (hooray!). Done:
- Abstract syntax
- Operational semantics (large-step and small-step)
- Semantic properties of (sets of) programs
- “Pseudo-denotational” semantics

Now:
- Packet-filter languages and other examples
- Equivalence of programs in a semantics
- Equivalence of different semantics

Next lecture: Local variables, lambda-calculus
Packet Filters

A very simple view of packet filters:

- Some bits come in off the wire
- Some application(s) want the “packet” and some do not (e.g., port number)
- For safety, only the O/S can access the wire
- For extensibility, the applications accept/reject packets

Conventional solution goes to user-space for every packet and app that wants (any) packets

Faster solution: Run app-written filters in kernel-space
What we need

Now the O/S writer is defining the packet-filter language!

Properties we wish of (untrusted) filters:

1. Do not corrupt kernel data structures
2. Terminate (within a time bound)
3. Run fast (the whole point)

Should we download some C/assembly code? (Get 1 of 3)

Should we make up a language and “hope” it has these properties?
Language-based approaches

1. Interpret a language
   + clean operational semantics, + portable, - may be slow (+ filter-specific optimizations), - unusual interface

2. Translate a language into C/assembly
   + clean denotational semantics, + employ existing optimizers, - upfront cost, - unusual interface

3. Require a conservative subset of C/assembly
   + normal interface, - too conservative w/o help

IMP has taught us about (1) and (2) — we’ll get to (3)
A General Pattern

Packet filters move the code to the data rather than data to the code

General reasons: performance, security, other?

Other examples:

- Query languages
- Active networks
- Client-side web scripts (Javascript)
Equivalence motivation

- Program equivalence (we change the program):
  - code optimizer
  - code maintainer

- Semantics equivalence (we change the language):
  - interpreter optimizer
  - language designer
    - (prove properties for equivalent semantics with easier proof)

Note: Proofs may seem easy with the right semantics and lemmas
  - (almost never start off with right semantics and lemmas)

Note: Small-step operational semantics often has harder proofs, but models more interesting things
What is equivalence?

Equivalence depends on *what is observable*!
What is equivalence?

Equivalence depends on what is observable!

- Partial I/O equivalence (if terminates, same ans)

- Total I/O equivalence (same termination behavior, same ans)

- Total heap equivalence (same termination behavior, same heaps)

- All (almost all?) variables have the same value

- Equivalence plus complexity bounds

- Is $O(2^n)$ really equivalent to $O(n)$?

- Is “runs within 10ms of each other” important?

- Syntactic equivalence (perhaps with renaming)

  Too strict to be interesting?
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- Partial I/O equivalence (if terminates, same ans)
  - while 1 skip equivalent to everything
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In PL, equivalence most often means total I/O equivalence.
What is equivalence?

Equivalence depends on *what is observable!*

- Partial I/O equivalence (if terminates, same ans)
  - *while 1 skip* equivalent to everything
  - not transitive

- Total I/O equivalence (same termination behavior, same ans)
- Total heap equivalence (same termination behavior, same heaps)
- All (almost all?) variables have the same value
- Equivalence plus complexity bounds
  - Is $O(2^n)$ really equivalent to $O(n)$? 
- Is “runs within 10ms of each other” important?
- Syntactic equivalence (perhaps with renaming)
  - Too strict to be interesting?
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  - while 1 skip equivalent to everything
  - not transitive

- Total I/O equivalence (same termination behavior, same ans)

- Total heap equivalence (same termination behavior, same heaps)
  - All (almost all?) variables have the same value
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Program Example: Strength Reduction

Motivation: Strength reduction

▶ A common compiler optimization due to architecture issues

Theorem: \( H ; e \ast 2 \downarrow c \) if and only if \( H ; e + e \downarrow c \)

Proof sketch:
Program Example: Strength Reduction

Motivation: Strength reduction

▶ A common compiler optimization due to architecture issues

Theorem: $H ; e * 2 \Downarrow c$ if and only if $H ; e + e \Downarrow c$

Proof sketch:

▶ Prove separately for each direction
Program Example: Strength Reduction

Motivation: Strength reduction

▶ A common compiler optimization due to architecture issues

Theorem: $H; e \times 2 \downarrow c$ if and only if $H; e + e \downarrow c$

Proof sketch:

▶ Prove separately for each direction

▶ Invert the assumed derivation, use hypotheses plus a little math to derive what we need
Program Example: Strength Reduction

Motivation: Strength reduction
  - A common compiler optimization due to architecture issues

Theorem: $H; e \times 2 \Downarrow c$ if and only if $H; e + e \Downarrow c$

Proof sketch:
  - Prove separately for each direction
  - Invert the assumed derivation, use hypotheses plus a little math to derive what we need
  - Hmm, doesn’t use induction. That’s because this theorem isn’t very useful...
Theorem: If $e'$ has a subexpression of the form $e \ast 2$, then $H ; e' \downarrow c'$ if and only if $H ; e'' \downarrow c'$ where $e''$ is $e'$ with $e \ast 2$ replaced with $e + e$
Program Example: Nested Strength Reduction

Theorem: If $e'$ has a subexpression of the form $e * 2$, then $H ; e' \downarrow c'$ if and only if $H ; e'' \downarrow c'$ where $e''$ is $e'$ with $e * 2$ replaced with $e + e$

First some useful metanotation:

$$C ::= [·] \mid C + e \mid e + C \mid C * e \mid e * C$$

$C[e]$ is “$C$ with $e$ in the hole” (inductive definition of “stapling”)

Crisper statement of theorem:

$H ; C[e * 2] \downarrow c'$ if and only if $H ; C[e + e] \downarrow c'$
Program Example: Nested Strength Reduction

Theorem: If $e'$ has a subexpression of the form $e \ast 2$, then $H ; e' \Downarrow c'$ if and only if $H ; e'' \Downarrow c'$ where $e''$ is $e'$ with $e \ast 2$ replaced with $e + e$

First some useful metanotation:

$$C ::= [\cdot] \mid C + e \mid e + C \mid C \ast e \mid e \ast C$$

$C[e]$ is “$C$ with $e$ in the hole” (inductive definition of “stapling”)

Crisper statement of theorem:

$$H ; C[e \ast 2] \Downarrow c'$$ if and only if

$$H ; C[e + e] \Downarrow c'$$

Proof sketch: By induction on structure (“syntax height”) of $C$

- The base case ($C = [\cdot]$) follows from our previous proof
- The rest is a long, tedious, (and instructive!) induction
Proof reuse

As we cannot emphasize enough, proving is just like programming

The proof of nested strength reduction had nothing to do with \( e \times 2 \) and \( e + e \) except in the base case where we used our previous theorem

A much more useful theorem would parameterize over the base case so that we could get the “nested \( X \)” theorem for any appropriate \( X \):

If \( (H; e_1 \Downarrow c \text{ if and only if } H; e_2 \Downarrow c) \),
then \( (H; C[e_1] \Downarrow c' \text{ if and only if } H; C[e_2] \Downarrow c') \)

The proof is identical except the base case is “by assumption”
Small-step program equivalence

These sort of proofs also work with small-step semantics (e.g., our IMP statements), but tend to be more cumbersome, even to state.

Example: The statement-sequence operator is associative. That is,

(a) For all \( n \), if \( H ; s_1; (s_2; s_3) \rightarrow^n H' ; \text{skip} \) then there exist \( H'' \) and \( n' \) such that \( H ; (s_1; s_2); s_3 \rightarrow^{n'} H'' ; \text{skip} \) and \( H''(\text{ans}) = H'(\text{ans}) \).

(b) If for all \( n \) there exist \( H' \) and \( s' \) such that \( H ; s_1; (s_2; s_3) \rightarrow^n H' ; s' \), then for all \( n \) there exist \( H'' \) and \( s'' \) such that \( H ; (s_1; s_2); s_3 \rightarrow^n H'' ; s'' \).

(Proof needs a much stronger induction hypothesis.)

One way to avoid it: Prove large-step and small-step semantics equivalent, then prove program equivalences in whichever is easier.
Language Equivalence Example

IMP w/o multiply large-step:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CONST} & \quad \text{VAR} \\
H ; c & \downarrow c & H ; x & \downarrow H(x)
\end{align*}
\]

IMP w/o multiply small-step:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SVAR} & \quad \text{SADD} \\
H ; x & \rightarrow H(x) \\
H ; e_1 & \rightarrow e'_1 \\
H ; e_1 + e_2 & \rightarrow e'_1 + e_2 \\
H ; c_1 + c_2 & \rightarrow c_1 + c_2 \\
H ; e_2 & \rightarrow e'_2 \\
H ; e_1 + e_2 & \rightarrow e_1 + e'_2
\end{align*}
\]

Theorem: Semantics are equivalent: \( H ; e \downarrow c \) if and only if \( H ; e \rightarrow^* c \)

Proof: We prove the two directions separately...
Proof, part 1

First assume \( H \downarrow e \) and show \( \exists n. H; e \rightarrow^n c \)
Proof, part 1

First assume $H; e \Downarrow c$ and show $\exists n. H; e \rightarrow^n c$

Lemma (prove it!): If $H; e \rightarrow^n e'$, then $H; e_1 + e \rightarrow^n e_1 + e'$
and $H; e + e_2 \rightarrow^n e' + e_2$.

▶ Proof by induction on $n$

▶ Inductive case uses SLEFT and SRIGHT
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- Proof by induction on $n$
- Inductive case uses SLEFT and SRIGHT
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Proof, part 1

First assume $H; e \downarrow c$ and show $\exists n. H; e \rightarrow^n c$

Lemma (prove it!): If $H; e \rightarrow^n e'$, then $H; e_1 + e \rightarrow^n e_1 + e'$ and $H; e + e_2 \rightarrow^n e' + e_2$.

- Proof by induction on $n$
- Inductive case uses SLEFT and SRIGHT

Given the lemma, prove by induction on derivation of $H; e \downarrow c$

- **CONST**: Derivation with CONST implies $e = c$, and we can derive $H; c \rightarrow^0 c$
- **VAR**: Derivation with VAR implies $e = x$ for some $x$ where $H(x) = c$, so derive $H; e \rightarrow^1 c$ with SVAR
Proof, part 1

First assume \( H ; e \Downarrow c \) and show \( \exists n. \; H ; e \rightarrow^n c \)

Lemma (prove it!): If \( H ; e \rightarrow^n e' \), then \( H ; e_1 + e \rightarrow^n e_1 + e' \)
and \( H ; e + e_2 \rightarrow^n e' + e_2 \).

- Proof by induction on \( n \)
- Inductive case uses SLEFT and SRIGHT

Given the lemma, prove by induction on derivation of \( H ; e \Downarrow c \)

- **CONST**: Derivation with \texttt{CONST} implies \( e = c \), and we can derive \( H ; c \rightarrow^0 c \)
- **VAR**: Derivation with \texttt{VAR} implies \( e = x \) for some \( x \) where \( H(x) = c \), so derive \( H ; e \rightarrow^1 c \) with \texttt{SVAR}
- **ADD**: ...
First assume $H ; e \Downarrow c$ and show $\exists n. H; e \rightarrow^n c$

Lemma (prove it!): If $H; e \rightarrow^n e'$, then $H; e_1 + e \rightarrow^n e_1 + e'$ and $H; e + e_2 \rightarrow^n e' + e_2$.

Given the lemma, prove by induction on derivation of $H ; e \Downarrow c$

- ... 
- **ADD**: Derivation with ADD implies $e = e_1 + e_2$, $c = c_1 + c_2$, $H ; e_1 \Downarrow c_1$, and $H ; e_2 \Downarrow c_2$ for some $e_1, e_2, c_1, c_2$. 

Part 1, continued
Part 1, continued

First assume $H ; e \Downarrow c$ and show $\exists n.\ H ; e \rightarrow^n c$

Lemma (prove it!): If $H ; e \rightarrow^n e'$, then $H ; e_1 + e \rightarrow^n e_1 + e'$ and $H ; e + e_2 \rightarrow^n e' + e_2$.

Given the lemma, prove by induction on derivation of $H ; e \Downarrow c$

- ... 

- ADD: Derivation with ADD implies $e = e_1 + e_2$, $c = c_1 + c_2$, $H ; e_1 \Downarrow c_1$, and $H ; e_2 \Downarrow c_2$ for some $e_1, e_2, c_1, c_2$.

By induction (twice), $\exists n_1, n_2.\ H ; e_1 \rightarrow^{n_1} c_1$ and $H ; e_2 \rightarrow^{n_2} c_2$. 
Part 1, continued

First assume $H; e \downarrow c$ and show $\exists n. H; e \rightarrow^nc$

Lemma (prove it!): If $H; e \rightarrow^nc'$, then $H; e_1 + e \rightarrow^nc_1 + c'$ and $H; e + e_2 \rightarrow^nc' + e_2$.

Given the lemma, prove by induction on derivation of $H; e \downarrow c$

- ...

- **ADD:** Derivation with **ADD** implies $e = e_1 + e_2$, $c = c_1 + c_2$, $H; e_1 \downarrow c_1$, and $H; e_2 \downarrow c_2$ for some $e_1, e_2, c_1, c_2$.

By induction (twice), $\exists n_1, n_2. H; e_1 \rightarrow^{n_1} c_1$ and $H; e_2 \rightarrow^{n_2} c_2$.

So by our lemma $H; e_1 + e_2 \rightarrow^{n_1} c_1 + e_2$ and $H; c_1 + e_2 \rightarrow^{n_2} c_1 + c_2$. 
Part 1, continued

First assume $H; e \downarrow c$ and show $\exists n. H; e \rightarrow^n c$.

Lemma (prove it!): If $H; e \rightarrow^n e'$, then $H; e_1 + e \rightarrow^n e_1 + e'$ and $H; e + e_2 \rightarrow^n e' + e_2$.

Given the lemma, prove by induction on derivation of $H; e \downarrow c$

- ...

- **ADD**: Derivation with ADD implies $e = e_1 + e_2$, $c = c_1 + c_2$, $H; e_1 \downarrow c_1$, and $H; e_2 \downarrow c_2$ for some $e_1, e_2, c_1, c_2$.

By induction (twice), $\exists n_1, n_2. H; e_1 \rightarrow^{n_1} c_1$ and $H; e_2 \rightarrow^{n_2} c_2$.

So by our lemma $H; e_1 + e_2 \rightarrow^{n_1} c_1 + e_2$ and $H; c_1 + e_2 \rightarrow^{n_2} c_1 + c_2$.

By **SADD** $H; c_1 + c_2 \rightarrow c_1 + c_2$. 
Part 1, continued

First assume $H \downarrow c$ and show $\exists n. H; e \rightarrow^c c$

Lemma (prove it!): If $H; e \rightarrow^c e'$, then $H; e_1 + e \rightarrow^c e_1 + e'$ and $H; e + e_2 \rightarrow^c e' + e_2$.

Given the lemma, prove by induction on derivation of $H \downarrow c$

- ... 
- ADD: Derivation with ADD implies $e = e_1 + e_2$, $c = c_1 + c_2$, $H; e_1 \downarrow c_1$, and $H; e_2 \downarrow c_2$ for some $e_1, e_2, c_1, c_2$.

By induction (twice), $\exists n_1, n_2. H; e_1 \rightarrow^{n_1} c_1$ and $H; e_2 \rightarrow^{n_2} c_2$.

So by our lemma $H; e_1 + e_2 \rightarrow^{n_1} c_1 + e_2$ and $H; c_1 + e_2 \rightarrow^{n_2} c_1 + c_2$.

By SADD $H; c_1 + c_2 \rightarrow c_1 + c_2$.

So $H; e_1 + e_2 \rightarrow^{n_1+n_2+1} c$. 
Proof, part 2

Now assume $\exists n. \ H; e \xrightarrow{n} c$ and show $H \ ; \ e \downarrow c$. 
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Now assume $\exists n. H; e \rightarrow^n c$ and show $H ; e \Downarrow c$.

Proof by induction on $n$:
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Now assume $\exists n. H; e \rightarrow^n c$ and show $H; e \Downarrow c$.

Proof by induction on $n$:

- $n = 0$: $e$ is $c$ and $\text{CONST}$ lets us derive $H; c \Downarrow c$
Proof, part 2

Now assume $\exists n. \ H; e \rightarrow^n c$ and show $H ; e \downarrow c$.

Proof by induction on $n$:

- $n = 0$: $e$ is $c$ and $\text{CONST}$ lets us derive $H ; c \downarrow c$
- $n > 0$: (Clever: break into first step and remaining ones)
  $\exists e'. \ H; e \rightarrow e'$ and $H; e' \rightarrow^{n-1} c$. 
Proof, part 2

Now assume \( \exists n. \; H; e \rightarrow^n c \) and show \( H; e \Downarrow c \).

Proof by induction on \( n \):

\begin{itemize}
  \item \( n = 0 \): \( e \) is \( c \) and \texttt{CONST} lets us derive \( H; c \Downarrow c \)
  \item \( n > 0 \): (Clever: break into first step and remaining ones)
    \begin{itemize}
      \item \( \exists e'. \; H; e \rightarrow e' \) and \( H; e' \rightarrow^{n-1} c \).
      \item By induction \( H; e' \Downarrow c \).
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}
Proof, part 2

Now assume $\exists n. H; e \rightarrow^n c$ and show $H; e \Downarrow c$.

Proof by induction on $n$:

- $n = 0$: $e$ is $c$ and **const** lets us derive $H; c \Downarrow c$
- $n > 0$: (Clever: break into first step and remaining ones)
  - $\exists e'. H; e \rightarrow e'$ and $H; e' \rightarrow^{n-1} c$.
  - By induction $H; e' \Downarrow c$.
  - So this lemma suffices: If $H; e \rightarrow e'$ and $H; e' \Downarrow c$, then $H; e \Downarrow c$. 


Proof, part 2

Now assume $\exists n. \ H; e \rightarrow^n c$ and show $H; e \downarrow c$.

Proof by induction on $n$:

- $n = 0$: $e$ is $c$ and $\text{CONST}$ lets us derive $H; c \downarrow c$

- $n > 0$: (Clever: break into first step and remaining ones)
  $\exists e'. \ H; e \rightarrow e'$ and $H; e' \rightarrow^{n-1} c$.
  By induction $H; e' \downarrow c$.
  So this lemma suffices: If $H; e \rightarrow e'$ and $H; e' \downarrow c$, then $H; e \downarrow c$.

Prove the lemma by induction on derivation of $H; e \rightarrow e'$:

- $\text{SVAR}$: ...

- $\text{SADD}$: ...

- $\text{SLEFT}$: ...

- $\text{SRIGHT}$: ...
Part 2, key lemma

Lemma: If $H; e \rightarrow e'$ and $H; e' \Downarrow c$, then $H; e \Downarrow c$.

Prove the lemma by induction on derivation of $H; e \rightarrow e'$:
Part 2, key lemma

Lemma: If $H; e \rightarrow e'$ and $H ; e' \Downarrow c$, then $H ; e \Downarrow c$.

Prove the lemma by induction on derivation of $H; e \rightarrow e'$:

- **SVAR**: Derivation with **SVAR** implies $e$ is some $x$ and $e' = H(x) = c$, so derive, by **VAR**, $H; x \Downarrow H(x)$. 

- **SADD**: Derivation with **SADD** implies $e$ is some $c_1 + c_2$ and $e' = c_1 + c_2 = c$, so derive, by **ADD** and two **CONST**, $H; c_1 + c_2 \Downarrow c_1 + c_2$.

- **SLEFT**: Derivation with **SLEFT** implies $e = e_1 + e_2$ and $e' = e'_1 + e_2$ and $H; e_1 \rightarrow e'_1$ for some $e_1, e_2, e'_1$. Since $e'_1 = e'_1 + e_2$ inverting assumption $H; e'_1 \Downarrow c$ gives $H; e'_1 \Downarrow c_1$, $H; e_2 \Downarrow c_2$ and $c = c_1 + c_2$.

Applying the induction hypothesis to $H; e_1 \Downarrow c_1$. So use **ADD**, $H; e_1 \Downarrow c_1$, and $H; e_2 \Downarrow c_2$ to derive $H; e_1 + e_2 \Downarrow c_1 + c_2$.

- **SRIGHT**: Analogous to **SLEFT**.
Part 2, key lemma

Lemma: If \( H; e \rightarrow e' \) and \( H; e' \Downarrow c \), then \( H; e \Downarrow c \).

Prove the lemma by induction on derivation of \( H; e \rightarrow e' \):
- **SVAR**: Derivation with \textsc{svar} implies \( e \) is some \( x \) and \( e' = H(x) = c \), so derive, by \textsc{var}, \( H; x \Downarrow H(x) \).
- **SADD**: Derivation with \textsc{sadd} implies \( e \) is some \( c_1 + c_2 \) and \( e' = c_1 + c_2 = c \), so derive, by \textsc{add} and two \textsc{const}, \( H; c_1 + c_2 \Downarrow c_1 + c_2 \).
Part 2, key lemma

Lemma: If $H; e \rightarrow e'$ and $H; e' \downarrow c$, then $H; e \downarrow c$.

Prove the lemma by induction on derivation of $H; e \rightarrow e'$:

- **SVAR**: Derivation with **SVAR** implies $e$ is some $x$ and $e' = H(x) = c$, so derive, by **VAR**, $H; x \downarrow H(x)$.
- **SADD**: Derivation with **SADD** implies $e$ is some $c_1 + c_2$ and $e' = c_1 + c_2 = c$, so derive, by **ADD** and two **CONST**, $H; c_1 + c_2 \downarrow c_1 + c_2$.
- **SLEFT**: Derivation with **SLEFT** implies $e = e_1 + e_2$ and $e' = e_1' + e_2$ and $H; e_1 \rightarrow e_1'$ for some $e_1, e_2, e_1'$. 
Part 2, key lemma

Lemma: If \( H; e \rightarrow e' \) and \( H; e' \Downarrow c \), then \( H; e \Downarrow c \).

Prove the lemma by induction on derivation of \( H; e \rightarrow e' \):

- **SVAR:** Derivation with **SVAR** implies \( e \) is some \( x \) and \( e' = H(x) = c \), so derive, by **VAR**, \( H; x \Downarrow H(x) \).

- **SADD:** Derivation with **SADD** implies \( e \) is some \( c_1 + c_2 \) and \( e' = c_1 + c_2 = c \), so derive, by **ADD** and two **CONST**, \( H; c_1 + c_2 \Downarrow c_1 + c_2 \).

- **SLEFT:** Derivation with **SLEFT** implies \( e = e_1 + e_2 \) and \( e' = e'_1 + e_2 \) and \( H; e_1 \rightarrow e'_1 \) for some \( e_1, e_2, e'_1 \). Since \( e' = e'_1 + e_2 \) inverting assumption \( H; e' \Downarrow c \) gives \( H; e'_1 \Downarrow c_1 \), \( H; e_2 \Downarrow c_2 \) and \( c = c_1 + c_2 \).
Part 2, key lemma

Lemma: If $H; e \rightarrow e'$ and $H; e' \downarrow c$, then $H; e \downarrow c$.

Prove the lemma by induction on derivation of $H; e \rightarrow e'$:

- **svar**: Derivation with **svar** implies $e$ is some $x$ and $e' = H(x) = c$, so derive, by **var**, $H; x \downarrow H(x)$.

- **sadd**: Derivation with **sadd** implies $e$ is some $c_1 + c_2$ and $e' = c_1 + c_2 = c$, so derive, by **add** and two **const**, $H; c_1 + c_2 \downarrow c_1 + c_2$.

- **sleft**: Derivation with **sleft** implies $e = e_1 + e_2$ and $e' = e'_1 + e_2$ and $H; e_1 \rightarrow e'_1$ for some $e_1, e_2, e'_1$. Since $e' = e'_1 + e_2$ inverting assumption $H; e' \downarrow c$ gives $H; e'_1 \downarrow c_1$, $H; e_2 \downarrow c_2$ and $c = c_1 + c_2$. Applying the induction hypothesis to $H; e_1 \rightarrow e'_1$ and $H; e'_1 \downarrow c_1$ gives $H; e_1 \downarrow c_1$. 

Part 2, key lemma

Lemma: If $H; e \rightarrow e'$ and $H; e' \Downarrow c$, then $H; e \Downarrow c$.

Prove the lemma by induction on derivation of $H; e \rightarrow e'$:

- **svar**: Derivation with svar implies $e$ is some $x$ and $e' = H(x) = c$, so derive, by var, $H; x \Downarrow H(x)$.

- **sadd**: Derivation with sadd implies $e$ is some $c_1 + c_2$ and $e' = c_1 + c_2 = c$, so derive, by add and two const, $H; c_1 + c_2 \Downarrow c_1 + c_2$.

- **sleft**: Derivation with sleft implies $e = e_1 + e_2$ and $e' = e_1' + e_2$ and $H; e_1 \rightarrow e_1'$ for some $e_1, e_2, e_1'$. Since $e' = e_1' + e_2$ inverting assumption $H; e' \Downarrow c$ gives $H; e_1' \Downarrow c_1, H; e_2 \Downarrow c_2$ and $c = c_1 + c_2$. Applying the induction hypothesis to $H; e_1 \rightarrow e_1'$ and $H; e_1' \Downarrow c_1$ gives $H; e_1 \Downarrow c_1$. So use add, $H; e_1 \Downarrow c_1$, and $H; e_2 \Downarrow c_2$ to derive $H; e_1 + e_2 \Downarrow c_1 + c_2$. 
Part 2, key lemma

Lemma: If $H; e \rightarrow e'$ and $H; e' \downarrow c$, then $H; e \downarrow c$.

Prove the lemma by induction on derivation of $H; e \rightarrow e'$:

- **SVAR**: Derivation with SVAR implies $e$ is some $x$ and $e' = H(x) = c$, so derive, by VAR, $H; x \downarrow H(x)$.

- **SADD**: Derivation with SADD implies $e$ is some $c_1 + c_2$ and $e' = c_1 + c_2 = c$, so derive, by ADD and two CONST, $H; c_1 + c_2 \downarrow c_1 + c_2$.

- **SLEFT**: Derivation with SLEFT implies $e = e_1 + e_2$ and $e' = e'_1 + e_2$ and $H; e_1 \rightarrow e'_1$ for some $e_1, e_2, e'_1$. Since $e' = e'_1 + e_2$ inverting assumption $H; e' \downarrow c$ gives $H; e'_1 \downarrow c_1, H; e_2 \downarrow c_2$ and $c = c_1 + c_2$. Applying the induction hypothesis to $H; e_1 \rightarrow e'_1$ and $H; e'_1 \downarrow c_1$ gives $H; e_1 \downarrow c_1$. So use ADD, $H; e_1 \downarrow c_1$, and $H; e_2 \downarrow c_2$ to derive $H; e_1 + e_2 \downarrow c_1 + c_2$.

- **SRIGHT**: Analogous to SLEFT
The cool part, redux

Step through the \texttt{SLLEFT} case more visually:

By assumption, we must have derivations that look like this:

\[
\frac{H; e_1 \rightarrow e'_1}{H; e_1 + e_2 \rightarrow e'_1 + e_2}
\]

\[
\frac{H; e'_1 \downarrow c_1}{H; e'_1 + e_2 \downarrow c_1 + c_2}
\]

Gr...
A nice payoff

Theorem: The small-step semantics is deterministic:
if $H; e \rightarrow^* c_1$ and $H; e \rightarrow^* c_2$, then $c_1 = c_2$

Proof:

Given $(((1 + 2) + (3 + 4)) + (5 + 6)) + (7 + 8)$
there are many execution sequences, which all produce 36 but with
different intermediate expressions
A nice payoff

Theorem: The small-step semantics is deterministic:
if \( H; e \rightarrow^* c_1 \) and \( H; e \rightarrow^* c_2 \), then \( c_1 = c_2 \)

Not obvious (see \texttt{sleft} and \texttt{sright}), nor do I know a direct proof

- Given \(((1 + 2) + (3 + 4)) + (5 + 6)) + (7 + 8)\) there are many execution sequences, which all produce 36 but with different intermediate expressions
Theorem: The small-step semantics is deterministic:
if $H; e \rightarrow^* c_1$ and $H; e \rightarrow^* c_2$, then $c_1 = c_2$

Not obvious (see sleft and sright), nor do I know a direct proof

- Given $(((1 + 2) + (3 + 4)) + (5 + 6)) + (7 + 8)$ there are many execution sequences, which all produce 36 but with different intermediate expressions

Proof:

- Large-step evaluation is deterministic (easy induction proof)
- Small-step and and large-step are equivalent (just proved that)
- So small-step is deterministic
- Convince yourself a deterministic and a nondeterministic semantics cannot be equivalent
Conclusions

- Equivalence is a subtle concept
- Proofs “seem obvious” only when the definitions are right
Conclusions

- Equivalence is a subtle concept
- Proofs “seem obvious” only when the definitions are right
- Some other language-equivalence claims:

Replace **WHILE** rule with

\[
\begin{align*}
H ; e \downarrow c & \quad c \leq 0 \\
\hline
H \; \text{while} e \; s & \rightarrow H ; \text{skip}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
H ; e \downarrow c & \quad c > 0 \\
\hline
H \; \text{while} e \; s & \rightarrow H \; ; s \; \text{while} e \; s
\end{align*}
\]
Conclusions

▶ Equivalence is a subtle concept
▶ Proofs “seem obvious” only when the definitions are right
▶ Some other language-equivalence claims:

Replace WHILE rule with

\[
\begin{align*}
H ; e \Downarrow c & \quad c \leq 0 \\
\hline \\
H ; \text{while } e \text{ } s & \rightarrow H ; \text{skip}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
H ; e \Downarrow c & \quad c > 0 \\
\hline \\
H ; \text{while } e \text{ } s & \rightarrow H ; s ; \text{while } e \text{ } s
\end{align*}
\]

Equivalent to our original language
Conclusions

- Equivalence is a subtle concept
- Proofs “seem obvious” only when the definitions are right
- Some other language-equivalence claims:

Replace WHILE rule with

\[
\begin{align*}
H ; e \downarrow c & \quad c \leq 0 \\
\hline
H ; \text{while } e \, s \rightarrow H ; \text{skip}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
H ; e \downarrow c & \quad c > 0 \\
\hline
H ; \text{while } e \, s \rightarrow H ; s ; \text{while } e \, s
\end{align*}
\]

Equivalent to our original language

Change syntax of heap and replace ASSIGN and VAR rules with

\[
\begin{align*}
H ; x := e \rightarrow H, x \mapsto e ; \text{skip}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
H ; H(x) \downarrow c
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
H ; x \downarrow c
\end{align*}
\]
Conclusions

▶ Equivalence is a subtle concept
▶ Proofs “seem obvious” only when the definitions are right
▶ Some other language-equivalence claims:

Replace \textbf{while} rule with

\[
\begin{align*}
H ; e \Downarrow c & \quad c \leq 0 \\
H & \quad \text{while } e \ s \rightarrow H ; \text{skip}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
H ; e \Downarrow c & \quad c > 0 \\
H & \quad \text{while } e \ s \rightarrow H ; s; \text{while } e \ s
\end{align*}
\]

Equivalent to our original language

Change syntax of heap and replace \textbf{ASSIGN} and \textbf{VAR} rules with

\[
\begin{align*}
H ; x := e & \rightarrow H, x \mapsto e ; \text{skip} \\
H ; H(x) \Downarrow c & \\
H ; x \Downarrow c
\end{align*}
\]

\textit{NOT} equivalent to our original language