Example cases for Exercise 24

Here are some sample cases for the inductive proof required in Exercise 24 on page 78 of Ramsey’s book.

Consider the rule for if:

\[
\langle e_1, \xi, \phi, \rho \rangle \Downarrow \langle v_1, \xi', \phi, \rho' \rangle \quad v_1 \neq 0
\]

\[
\langle e_2, \xi', \phi, \rho' \rangle \Downarrow \langle v_2, \xi'', \phi, \rho'' \rangle
\]

\[
\langle \text{IF(True)}, e_1, e_2, e_3 \rangle, \xi, \phi, \rho \Downarrow \langle v_2, \xi'', \phi, \rho'' \rangle.
\]  

(IIFTrue)

By the induction hypothesis, we can evaluate \( \langle e_1, \xi, \phi, \rho \rangle \Downarrow \langle v_1, \xi', \phi, \rho' \rangle \) using a stack, and the evaluation will pop \( \rho \) and push \( \rho' \) without making a copy of \( \rho \). Because \( \rho \) does not appear anywhere else in the rule, it is never used again, so it is safe to pop it and throw it away. We can use the induction hypothesis again to show that the evaluation of \( e_2 \) can pop \( \rho' \) and push \( \rho'' \), and \( \rho' \) is not copied. Moreover, \( \rho' \) is not used in the rule after the evaluation of \( e_2 \).

Finally, we see that \( \rho'' \) is used only as part of the result of the rule. We can conclude, then, that when \( e_1 \) evaluates to a nonzero value, we can safely evaluate \( \text{IF(e_1, e_2, e_3)} \) on a stack, and the evaluation effectively pops \( \rho \), which is never used again, then pushes \( \rho'' \).

The FormalVar rule is one of the base cases; it doesn’t require the induction hypothesis.

\[
x \in \text{dom} \rho \\
\langle \text{VAR(x)}, \xi, \phi, \rho \rangle \Downarrow \langle \rho(x), \xi, \phi, \rho \rangle
\]  

(FormalVar)

By examining the rule, we see that it is possible to implement it as follows: pop \( \rho \), test \( x \in \text{dom} \rho \), and compute \( \rho(x) \). Then push \( \rho \) back on the environment stack, after which the only copy is once again on top of the stack.