
Big Step Semantics

State

state = *heap* × *locals*

locals = *vname* → *val*

heap = *addr* → *obj*

obj = *cname* × *fields*

fields = *vname* × *cname* → *val*

Example state:

$([7 \mapsto (B, [(F, B) \mapsto Addr\ 1]),$
 $5 \mapsto (C, [(F, C) \mapsto Bool\ True, (F, B) \mapsto Intg\ 5])],$
 $[V \mapsto Null])$

Is this state “welformed”?

Question

What is the key difference between our abstract state and some concrete representation in memory?

Variable names

s :: *state*

l :: *locals*

h :: *heap*

Abbreviations

true ≡ Val(*Bool True*) *false* ≡ Val(*Bool False*)
addr a ≡ Val(*Addr a*) *null* ≡ Val *Null*
unit ≡ Val *Unit*

Expression evaluation

Transition format:

$$P \vdash \langle e, s \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$$

where e' is fully evaluated: a value (or an exception)

Evaluation rules

Val and Var

$$P \vdash \langle \text{val } v, s \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{val } v, s \rangle$$

$$I V = [v] \Longrightarrow P \vdash \langle \text{var } V, (h, l) \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{val } v, (h, l) \rangle$$

Note

Semantics is defensive

Example: $\langle \text{Var } V, (h, I) \rangle$ can only evaluate if $V \in \text{dom } I$

Field access

$\llbracket P \vdash \langle e, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{addr } a, (h, l) \rangle \rrbracket;$

$h a = \llbracket (C, fs) \rrbracket; fs (F, D) = \llbracket v \rrbracket \rrbracket$

$\Longrightarrow P \vdash \langle e.F\{D\}, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{val } v, (h, l) \rangle$

Binary operations

$\llbracket P \vdash \langle e_1, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{Val } v_1, s_1 \rangle;$

$P \vdash \langle e_2, s_1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{Val } v_2, s_2 \rangle;$

$\text{binop}(bop, v_1, v_2) = \llbracket v \rrbracket$

$\implies P \vdash \langle e_1 \ll bop \gg e_2, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{Val } v, s_2 \rangle$

new

new-Addr h \equiv

if $\exists a. h a = \text{None}$ then $\lfloor \text{SOME } a. h a = \text{None} \rfloor$ else None

init-fi elds $:: ((vname \times cname) \times ty) \text{ list} \Rightarrow \text{fi elds}$

init-fi elds $\equiv \text{map-of} \circ \text{map } (\lambda(F, T). (F, \text{default-val } T))$

$\llbracket \text{new-Addr } h = \lfloor a \rfloor ;$

$P \vdash C \text{ has-fi elds FDTs};$

$h' = h(a \mapsto (C, \text{init-fi elds FDTs})) \rrbracket$

$\Longrightarrow P \vdash \langle \text{new } C, (h, I) \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{addr } a, (h', I) \rangle$

Cast

$$P \vdash \langle e, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{null}, s_1 \rangle \Longrightarrow$$
$$P \vdash \langle \text{Cast } C e, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{null}, s_1 \rangle$$
$$\llbracket P \vdash \langle e, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{addr } a, (h, l) \rangle;$$
$$h a = \lfloor (D, fs) \rfloor; P \vdash D \preceq^* C \rrbracket$$
$$\Longrightarrow P \vdash \langle \text{Cast } C e, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{addr } a, (h, l) \rangle$$

Variable assignment

$$P \vdash \langle e, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{val } v, (h, l) \rangle \implies$$
$$P \vdash \langle V := e, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{unit}, (h, l(V \mapsto v)) \rangle$$

In Java: `val v` instead of `unit`.

Problem:

$$\text{if } (b) V_1 := e_1 \text{ else } V_2 := e_2$$

Would not be type correct in Jinja if $\text{type}(V_1) \neq \text{type}(V_2)$.

Field assignment

$$\llbracket P \vdash \langle e_1, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{addr } a, s_1 \rangle; \rrbracket$$

$$P \vdash \langle e_2, s_1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{val } v, (h_2, l_2) \rangle;$$

$$h_2 a = \lfloor (C, fs) \rfloor; fs' = fs((F, D) \mapsto v);$$

$$h_2' = h_2(a \mapsto (C, fs')) \rrbracket$$

$$\implies P \vdash \langle e_1.F\{D\} := e_2, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{unit}, (h_2', l_2) \rangle$$

Method call

$\llbracket P \vdash \langle e, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{addr } a, s_1 \rangle \rrbracket;$

$P \vdash \langle ps, s_1 \rangle [\Rightarrow] \langle \text{map } \forall a \perp vs, (h_2, l_2) \rangle;$

$h_2 a = \lfloor (C, fs) \rfloor;$

$P \vdash C \text{ sees } M: Ts \rightarrow T = (pns, \text{body}) \text{ in } D;$

$|vs| = |pns|; l_2' = [\text{this} \mapsto \text{Addr } a, pns \mapsto] vs];$

$P \vdash \langle \text{body}, (h_2, l_2') \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e', (h_3, l_3) \rangle \rrbracket$

$\Longrightarrow P \vdash \langle e.M(ps), s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e', (h_3, l_2) \rangle$

$$P \vdash \langle es, s \rangle [\Rightarrow] \langle es', s \rangle$$

Evaluate es from left to right:

$$P \vdash \langle [], s \rangle [\Rightarrow] \langle [], s \rangle$$

$$\llbracket P \vdash \langle e, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{val } v, s_1 \rangle;$$

$$P \vdash \langle es, s_1 \rangle [\Rightarrow] \langle es', s_2 \rangle \rrbracket$$

$$\implies P \vdash \langle e \cdot es, s_0 \rangle [\Rightarrow] \langle \text{val } v \cdot es', s_2 \rangle$$

Why $\text{val } v$ and not just e' ?

Because of exceptions (later).

Local variable

$$P \vdash \langle e_0, (h_0, l_0(V := None)) \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e_1, (h_1, l_1) \rangle \Longrightarrow$$
$$P \vdash \langle \{V:T; e_0\}, (h_0, l_0) \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e_1, (h_1, l_1(V := l_0 V)) \rangle$$

Sequential composition

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket P \vdash \langle e_0, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{val } v, s_1 \rangle; \\ & P \vdash \langle e_1, s_1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e_2, s_2 \rangle \rrbracket \\ \implies & P \vdash \langle e_0 ; e_1, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e_2, s_2 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Conditional

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket P \vdash \langle e, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{true}, s_1 \rangle; P \vdash \langle e_1, s_1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e', s_2 \rangle \rrbracket \\ & \implies P \vdash \langle \text{if } (e) e_1 \text{ else } e_2, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e', s_2 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \llbracket P \vdash \langle e, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{false}, s_1 \rangle; P \vdash \langle e_2, s_1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e', s_2 \rangle \rrbracket \\ & \implies P \vdash \langle \text{if } (e) e_1 \text{ else } e_2, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e', s_2 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

While loop

$$P \vdash \langle e, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{false}, s_1 \rangle \Longrightarrow$$
$$P \vdash \langle \text{while } (e) \text{ } c, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{unit}, s_1 \rangle$$
$$\llbracket P \vdash \langle e, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{true}, s_1 \rangle;$$
$$P \vdash \langle c, s_1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle \text{val } v_1, s_2 \rangle;$$
$$P \vdash \langle \text{while } (e) \text{ } c, s_2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e_3, s_3 \rangle \rrbracket$$
$$\Longrightarrow P \vdash \langle \text{while } (e) \text{ } c, s_0 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e_3, s_3 \rangle$$

Digression: simultaneous inductive definitions

$P \vdash \langle e, s \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$ and $P \vdash \langle es, s \rangle [\Rightarrow] \langle es', s' \rangle$ are defined simultaneously:

$P \vdash \langle e, s \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$ uses $P \vdash \langle es, s \rangle [\Rightarrow] \langle es', s' \rangle$ and
 $P \vdash \langle es, s \rangle [\Rightarrow] \langle es', s' \rangle$ uses $P \vdash \langle e, s \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$.

Consequence: *simultaneous rule induction*:

$P \vdash \langle e, s \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle \Longrightarrow R_1 P e s e' s'$
 $P \vdash \langle es, s \rangle \Rightarrow \langle es', s' \rangle \Longrightarrow R_2 P es s es' s'$

must be proved simultaneously.

Slight complication: property R_2 is auxiliary and needs to be determined. Usually R_2 is R_1 lifted to lists.

Example: Final expressions

final $e \equiv \exists v. e = \text{Val } v$

finals $es \equiv \exists vs. es = \text{map Val } vs$

Lemma If $P \vdash \langle e, s \rangle \Rightarrow \langle e', s' \rangle$ then *final* e' .

If $P \vdash \langle es, s \rangle [\Rightarrow] \langle es', s' \rangle$ then *finals* es' .

Proof by simultaneous rule induction.