

Supplement: LaTeX Cheat-Sheet (In-Progress)

CPSC 509: Programming Language Principles

Ronald Garcia*

1 February 2014

Here's where I throw in a bunch of LaTeX that I have been using. For sanity's sake I need your help to grow this organically. Ideally It will help you with typesetting your own materials. Let me know what pieces are missing and I will add them.

1 Explicit Sets, Set Comprehensions, and Tuples

I use the `braket.sty` package to typeset tuples and sets:

$$\begin{aligned} & \{a, b, c\} \\ & \{a \in A \mid a \notin B\} \\ & \langle a, b, c \rangle \end{aligned}$$

2 Object Language Bits

Why so blue? Well, because I typeset object language items using the `\mbsf{}` or `\tbsf{}` macros defined in `defs.tex`.

3 Typesetting BNF's

Here's the language of Boolean and Arithmetic Expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} t & \in \text{TERM}, \quad v \in \text{VALUE}, \quad nv \in \text{NUM} \\ t & ::= \text{true} \mid \text{false} \mid \text{if } t \text{ then } t \text{ else } t \\ & \quad \mid z \mid \text{succ}(t) \mid \text{pred}(t) \mid \text{zero?}(t) \\ v & ::= \text{true} \mid \text{false} \mid nv \\ nv & ::= z \mid \text{succ}(nv) \end{aligned}$$

If you look at the file, you will see things like `\<if> t \<then> t \<else> t` which come out like `if t then t else t`. I am using the keyword feature of the `semantic.sty` package to define special keywords that I can refer to in angle brackets. In this particular case, the definition in `defs.tex` that brings things to life is:

```
\reservestyle{\oblant}{\tbsf}

\oblant{if-then-else,
  true,false,if[if\;],then[\;then\;],else[\;else\;]
}
```

*© Ronald Garcia. Not to be copied, used, or revised without explicit written permission from the copyright owner.

The `\reservestyle` macro creates a new “style” command (in this case `\oblantg`) which I can use to create keywords (the thing before the square brackets) and what text they will render (the thing inside the square brackets) using the style function given in the `\reservestyle` keyword. For example, `\<if>` actually translates to `\tbsf{if\;}` where `\;` is the latex command for “leave some space”.

4 A Function Definition

Let $nat : \text{NUM} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} nat(\mathbf{z}) &= 0 \\ nat(\mathbf{succ}(nv)) &= 1 + nat(nv). \end{aligned}$$

5 An Inductive Definition

$\Downarrow \subseteq \text{TERM} \times \text{VALUE}$

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{}{\mathbf{true} \Downarrow \mathbf{true}} \text{ (etrue)} \quad \frac{}{\mathbf{false} \Downarrow \mathbf{false}} \text{ (efalse)} \quad \frac{t_1 \Downarrow \mathbf{true} \quad t_2 \Downarrow v_2}{\mathbf{if } t_1 \mathbf{ then } t_2 \mathbf{ else } t_3 \Downarrow v_2} \text{ (eif-t)} \\ \frac{t_1 \Downarrow \mathbf{false} \quad t_3 \Downarrow v_3}{\mathbf{if } t_1 \mathbf{ then } t_2 \mathbf{ else } t_3 \Downarrow v_3} \text{ (eif-f)} \quad \frac{}{\mathbf{z} \Downarrow \mathbf{z}} \text{ (ez)} \quad \frac{t \Downarrow nv}{\mathbf{succ}(t) \Downarrow \mathbf{succ}(nv)} \text{ (esucc)} \quad \frac{t \Downarrow \mathbf{succ}(nv)}{\mathbf{pred}(t) \Downarrow nv} \text{ (epred)} \\ \frac{t \Downarrow \mathbf{z}}{\mathbf{zero?}(t) \Downarrow \mathbf{true}} \text{ (ezero?-z)} \quad \frac{t \Downarrow \mathbf{succ}(nv)}{\mathbf{zero?}(t) \Downarrow \mathbf{false}} \text{ (ezero?-s)} \end{array}$$

In the past I have tended to use `\inference` from `semantic.sty` to define inductive rules, and `\infer` from `proof.sty` to write derivations, because I think the `\inference` is prettier, but using it to write derivations is a big space hog. I’m moving toward consistently using `\infer` for everything just to keep it simple. Hence, the rules above are typeset using `\infer`.

Beware! `\inference` and `\infer` take their arguments in opposite order, so if you switch, then you have to switch the arguments too, otherwise you’ll end up with errors or upside-down derivations/rules.

6 A Concrete Derivation

As an example derivation of an entailment relation, here is a derivation of $\emptyset \vdash \mathbf{A} \vee \perp \supset \mathbf{A} \mathbf{ true}$, meaning that it is a theorem of constructive propositional logic (it can be entailed with no assumptions):

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{}{\{\mathbf{A} \vee \perp\} \vdash \mathbf{A} \vee \perp \mathbf{ true}} \text{ (hyp)} \quad \frac{}{\{\mathbf{A} \vee \perp, \perp\} \vdash \perp \mathbf{ true}} \text{ (hyp)}}{\{\mathbf{A} \vee \perp, \perp\} \vdash \mathbf{A} \mathbf{ true}} \text{ (}\perp\text{E)}}{\{\mathbf{A} \vee \perp\} \vdash \mathbf{A} \mathbf{ true}} \text{ (}\vee\text{E)}}{\emptyset \vdash \mathbf{A} \vee \perp \supset \mathbf{A} \mathbf{ true}} \text{ (}\Rightarrow\text{I)}$$

7 Abstract Derivations and Properties of Derivations

This is useful for seeing how to typeset abstract derivations, where you don’t see everything

Let $P(\mathcal{D})$ be a predicate on (or property of) derivations \mathcal{D} . Then P holds for all derivations \mathcal{D} if:

1. $P\left(\frac{}{\mathbf{true} \in \text{TERM}} \text{ (r-true)}\right)$ holds;

2. $P\left(\overline{\text{false} \in \text{TERM}} \text{ (r-false)}\right)$ holds;
3. If $P\left(r_1 \in \overset{\mathcal{D}_1}{\text{TERM}}\right)$, $P\left(r_2 \in \overset{\mathcal{D}_2}{\text{TERM}}\right)$, and $P\left(r_3 \in \overset{\mathcal{D}_3}{\text{TERM}}\right)$ hold then

$$P\left(\frac{\overset{\mathcal{D}_1}{r_1 \in \text{TERM}} \quad \overset{\mathcal{D}_2}{r_2 \in \text{TERM}} \quad \overset{\mathcal{D}_3}{r_3 \in \text{TERM}}}{\text{if } r_1 \text{ then } r_2 \text{ else } r_3 \in \text{TERM}} \text{ (r-if)}\right)$$

holds.

Note the use of `\deduce` instead of `infer` to omit the horizontal bar. The `\sarray` macro, provided by `defs.tex` is a trick to get the large parentheses to size correctly (try removing it and see what happens).

Notice that when writing properties of derivations, I wrap the derivation in an `\sarray` form, which is defined in `defs.tex`. That keeps there from being extra annoying blank space at the bottom of the derivation. I don't have a good explanation for why this is necessary I'm afraid.

8 A Definition by Cases

This definition uses the `case` environment to lay out the three possible cases.

Define $eval_{BA} : \text{TERM} \rightarrow \{\text{true}, \text{false}\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ by

$$eval_{BA}(t) = \begin{cases} \text{true} & \text{if } t \Downarrow \text{true} \\ \text{false} & \text{if } t \Downarrow \text{false} \\ nat(nv) & \text{if } t \Downarrow nv \end{cases}$$

9 A Proposition

Proposition 1 (Inversion).

1. If $\text{true} \Downarrow v$ then $v = \text{true}$.
2. If $\text{false} \Downarrow v$ then $v = \text{false}$.
3. If $\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 \Downarrow v$ then either
 - (a) $t_1 \Downarrow \text{true}$ and $t_2 \Downarrow v$ or
 - (b) $t_1 \Downarrow \text{false}$ and $t_3 \Downarrow v$
4. If $z \Downarrow v$ then $v = z$.
5. If $\text{succ}(t) \Downarrow v$ then $t \Downarrow v_1$, $v_1 \in \text{NUM}$, and $v = \text{succ}(v_1)$.
6. If $\text{pred}(t) \Downarrow v$ then $t \Downarrow \text{succ}(v)$ and $v \in \text{NUM}$.
7. If $\text{zero?}(t) \Downarrow v$ then either
 - (a) $t \Downarrow z$ and $v = \text{true}$ or
 - (b) $t \Downarrow \text{succ}(nv)$ and $v = \text{false}$.

10 A Logical Statement (about derivations)

To prove these propositions, we first expand them to be formal statements about derivations. For example, item 7 expands to the following:

Proposition 2. $\forall \mathcal{D}. \mathcal{D} :: \text{zero?}(t) \Downarrow v \Rightarrow ((\exists \mathcal{E}. \mathcal{E} :: t \Downarrow z) \wedge v = \text{true}) \vee ((\exists \mathcal{E}. \mathcal{E} :: t \Downarrow \text{succ}(nv)) \wedge v = \text{false})$

11 A Trace (Using Let)

$\text{let } x = 5$
 $\text{in } x + x \rightarrow \text{let } x = 5$
 $\text{in } x + x \rightarrow \text{let } x = 5$
 $\text{in } x + x \rightarrow \text{let } x = 5$
 $\text{in } x + x \rightarrow \text{let } x = 5$
 $\text{in } x + x \rightarrow \text{let } x = 5$
 $\text{in } x + x \rightarrow \text{let } x = 5$
 $\text{in } x + x \rightarrow \text{let } x = 5$
 $\text{in } x + x \rightarrow$

$\text{let } x = 5$
 $\text{in } x + x \rightarrow \text{let } x = 5$
 $\text{in } x + x \rightarrow \text{let } x = 5$
 $\text{in } x + x \rightarrow \dots$