

# An Operational Semantics for Yul

Vasileios Koutavas<sup>1,3</sup> , Yu-Yang Lin<sup>1</sup>  , and Nikos Tzevelekos<sup>2</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland {Vasileios.Koutavas, linhouy}@tcd.ie

<sup>2</sup> Queen Mary University of London, London, UK nikos.tzevelekos@qmul.ac.uk

<sup>3</sup> Lero - Science Foundation Ireland Research Centre for Software, Limerick, Ireland

**Abstract.** We present a big-step and small-step operational semantics for Yul—the intermediate language used by the Solidity compiler to produce EVM bytecode—in a mathematical notation that is congruous with the literature of programming languages, lends itself to language proofs, and can serve as a precise, widely accessible specification for the language. Our two semantics stay faithful to the original, informal specification of the language but also clarify under-specified cases such as void function calls. Our presentation allows us to prove the equivalence between the two semantics. We also implement the small-step semantics in an interpreter for Yul which avails of optimisations that are provably correct. We have tested the interpreter using tests from the Solidity compiler and our own. We envisage that this work will enable the development of verification and symbolic execution technology directly in Yul, contributing to the Ethereum security ecosystem, as well as aid the development of a provably sound future type system.

**Keywords:** Yul, Ethereum, Operational semantics, Programming languages, Formal methods

## 1 Introduction

Smart contracts are programs stored on a blockchain, executed within transactions, which read and write data on said blockchain. They form an underpinning technology for decentralised finance applications by enabling the programming of autonomous services offering lending, auction, new cryptocurrency creation, and virtually any type of transactional facilities. On Ethereum—the largest blockchain with the ability to execute smart contracts—smart contracts are typically written in a high-level programming language, predominantly Solidity, and then compiled down to Ethereum Virtual Machine (EVM) instructions. Smart contracts already control significant amounts of cryptocurrency<sup>4</sup>, making them security-critical software. Numerous documented exploits and bugs have resulted in the loss of billions of dollars worth of cryptocurrency for users [1, 15, 37], making smart contract correctness and security a problem of critical importance, especially since these are immutable once deployed on the blockchain.

---

<sup>4</sup> As of 24 June 2024, DefiLlama (<https://defillama.com/chain/Ethereum>) lists a Total Value Locked (TVL) of USD 59.937b, equal to ETH 17.31m, on Ethereum.

The Solidity compiler team recently introduced Yul, an intermediate representation (IR) language sitting between Solidity and EVM bytecode, with one of its stated goals being to help with the implementation of formal verification and optimisation techniques [38]. Although such tools for Ethereum smart contracts exist, they either work with Solidity (e.g. SOLHINT [9], SLITHER [8,19], ECHIDNA [5,22], GAMBIT [6]) or EVM bytecode (e.g. MYTHRIL [7,36], OYENTE [2,30], MANTICORE [4,33]), making them hard to develop and maintain because of the feature-rich, often evolving syntax of the former, or the low-level stack- and jump-based design of the latter. Thus, Yul is designed on a small number of high-level constructs—loops, functions, conditional/switch and local variables—avoiding stack and jump complexity, and includes flexible, dialect-specific built-ins and data types.<sup>5</sup> All modern Solidity code can be compiled to Yul through the Solidity compiler, and almost all existing EVM bytecode can be decompiled to it [21].

In order for Yul to serve its intended purpose, it needs to have precise formal semantics on which formal verification techniques can be developed and optimisations can be proven correct. The official documentation of Yul [38]<sup>6</sup> only provides an informal description of the language, its grammar, scoping rules, and its dynamic semantics in terms of an evaluation function written in pseudocode. Although sufficient to understand the intent of the language constructs, the documentation is not a rigorous enough specification of Yul on which to base formal proofs. As an example, the dynamic semantics in the documentation do not explicitly handle the case for calling functions with no return variables, which must be treated as statements rather than expressions (cf. Sec. 3.5 and Rem. 9).

A number of mechanisations of the intended semantics of Yul in formal tools have appeared online. These include a shallow embedding of Yul into Dafny [11,12], and deep embeddings into the K-framework [18], Isabelle/HOL [3], Lean [34], and ACL2 [25]. Although these contribute significantly towards the goal of giving a solid mathematical footing for the semantics of Yul, they have inherent shortcomings. Besides not being peer-reviewed, their main drawback is that in order to understand these mechanisations, one is required to have working knowledge of the formal tools used, something that, although increasingly more common, is certainly not universal among those who have received training in programming languages. Moreover, the tools used lend themselves more readily to mechanically formalising the details of various semantics rather than communicating them to experts. For example, the mechanisations of Yul contain explicit implementation of mathematical details that are otherwise conceptually straightforward (e.g. pattern-matching and manipulation of low-level dependencies such as sets, mappings, lists, etc), making them too lengthy and complex to serve as a high-level model of the language. Moreover, formalisation tools often incur engineering considerations that arise from their specific framework or underlying theories, which may require reshaping the presentation into

<sup>5</sup> Although currently Yul is used only with EVM primitives, it is designed to be parametric to a *dialect* specifying the data types and machine instructions.

<sup>6</sup> Current latest version and the one accessed is v0.8.26 of the Solidity compiler

a less standard form. Finally, to even write a mechanisation of the Yul semantics one must first have a mental mathematical model of the language, which to our knowledge does not yet publicly exist. All this makes the existing Yul mechanisations hard to understand or trust as being equivalent to each other, which limits their suitability as definitive presentations of the semantics of Yul. For these reasons, we believe that the development of a diverse tool ecosystem for Yul would benefit from a more abstract, widely understood standard mathematical model thereof.

In this paper we contribute in this direction by providing a mathematical semantics of the language in textbook notation that, staying faithful to the intent of the original informal specification, can serve as a useful, widely understood, precise reference document. We hope our work to be useful for future programming language and formal verification research and implementations for Yul, the evolution of the language (e.g. when the community decides to provide Yul with a type system and prove type soundness), and the validation of the existing mechanisations by comparing them with a more abstract model.

We present here an abstract syntax of Yul (Sec. 2), together with both a big-step and small-step operational semantics (Sec. 3), and prove their correspondence (Sec. 4). We choose to present both styles of semantics because a big-step semantics is typically more intuitive and human-readable, and more readily relates to the informal specification of Yul, while a small-step semantics is easier to implement, especially in interpreters and symbolic execution tools. Note that we present only the semantics for Yul, which is given separately from the semantics of EVM bytecode and dialect-specific notation such as objects. As mentioned earlier, this is because Yul is intended to be parametric to the specific dialect implemented. We also present a modular implementation of the semantics of Yul in the form of an interpreter that is parametric on a given dialect and avails of optimisations that are provably correct (Sec. 5). At the moment, this interpreter includes a subset of the semantics of the Shanghai upgrade of EVM as its only dialect, which is sufficient to evaluate the correctness of our semantics experimentally. As such, our prototype interpreter only executes *closed* programs that make use of a subset of the instructions available to the EVM. We evaluate our implementation with sample implementations of standard algorithms and tests from the Solidity compiler. Finally, we discuss related work (Sec. 6) and conclusions (Sec. 7). Our work has been motivated by our ongoing efforts to implement a complete symbolic execution engine of EVM-dialect Yul, which would not have been possible without the semantics presented herein.

## 2 Yul Syntax

Yul is designed to be a highly readable language with simple syntax and semantics that is as direct to transform into bytecode as possible. Because the EVM—the primary target of the language—is a stack machine, Yul achieves these goals by providing syntax that replaces control-flow and variable management operations that would usually be done via stack operations (e.g. `push`, `pop`) and jumps.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Stmt: } S ::= & \{S^*\} \mid \text{function } x(\vec{x}) \rightarrow \vec{x}\{S^*\} \mid \text{let } \vec{x} := M \mid \vec{x} := M \mid M \mid \text{if } M\{S^*\} \\
& \mid \text{switch } M(\text{case } v\{S^*\})^* \text{default}\{S^*\} \mid \text{for}\{S^*\}M\{S^*\}\{S^*\} \\
& \mid \text{break} \mid \text{continue} \mid \text{leave} \\
\text{Exp: } M ::= & x(\vec{M}) \mid \text{op}(\vec{M}) \mid x \mid v \quad \text{Val: } u, v, c \quad \text{Var: } x, y, z, f
\end{aligned}$$

**Fig. 1.** Yul source-level syntax.

We define the *source-level* abstract syntax of Yul; that is, the syntax of Yul programs, in Fig. 1. In this grammar we range over (dialect-specific) values or constants with  $u, v, c$ , variables with  $x, y, z$ , statements with  $S$  and expressions with  $M$ , and variants thereof. We use vector syntax (e.g.  $\vec{x}$ ) to mean a comma-separated, consecutively-indexed list of syntax ( $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ ), and the Kleene star (e.g.  $S^*$ ) to mean consecutively-indexed juxtaposition of syntax without commas ( $S_1 S_2 \dots S_m$ ). We next explain the syntactical constructs and their intention.

- **Block statement:**  $\{S^*\}$ . These are sequences of statements that are to be executed one after the other unless a halting statement is encountered.

- **Function definition:**  $\text{function } x(\vec{x}_i) \rightarrow \vec{x}_o\{S^*\}$ . These contain the function name  $x$ , a vector of argument variables  $\vec{x}_i$ , a vector of return variables  $\vec{x}_o$ , and a function body block  $\{S^*\}$ . Functions can return zero (hereafter referred to as void functions), one, or a tuple of values (hereafter referred to as multi-value functions). The use of curly braces in the function body is semantically important as blocks are leveraged to define the scope of variables in a function call. Actual arguments are assigned to  $\vec{x}_i$  when entering—and return values are those assigned to  $\vec{x}_o$  when exiting—the function block.

- **Variable declaration/assignment:**  $\text{let } \vec{x} := M \mid \vec{x} := M$ . Their behaviour is identical except for the conditions involved:  $\vec{x}$  cannot be in scope if declared with a `let`-statement and must be in scope for standard assignment. The syntax allows for multi-value assignment, with  $M$  being an expression which must match the arity of  $\vec{x}$ . As tuples are not part of the source-level syntax, they can only occur as a result of calling a multi-value function. Tuples do not appear in Fig. 1 but will be introduced in the runtime syntax in Sec. 3. The Yul specification [38] allows for uninitialised declarations. For simplicity we consider these to be syntactic sugar for function calls returning the correct arity of zeros.

- **Conditional statement:**  $\text{if } M\{S^*\}$ .  $M$  must evaluate to a constant that represents either `tt` or `ff`, and  $\{S^*\}$  is a block for scoping reasons; there are no else-branches in conditionals.

- **Switch statement:**  $\text{switch } M(\text{case } v\{S^*\})^* \text{default}\{S^*_d\}$ . If  $M$  evaluates to constant  $v_i$  then block  $\{S^*_i\}$  executes, otherwise  $\{S^*_d\}$  does.

- **Loop:**  $\text{for}\{S^*_i\}M\{S^*_p\}\{S^*_b\}$ . Loops comprise an initialisation block  $\{S^*_i\}$ , a conditional expression  $M$  which evaluates to `tt` or `ff` at each iteration, a post-iteration block  $\{S^*_p\}$  for updating loop variables, and a loop body  $\{S^*_b\}$ .

- **Halting statement:** `break`, `continue`, `leave`. These are control-flow statements; `break` and `continue` may only occur in loop bodies to exit the loop or skip

the rest of the loop body and continue to the post-iteration block, respectively; `leave` only occurs inside function bodies to exit the current function (cf. Def. 13).

– **Function call expression:**  $x(\vec{M})$ . A function call is normally a part of an expression and returns a single value. However there are two special cases of note: (1) a function call can appear as the expression of a multi-value declaration/assignment and must return a tuple of values of the correct arity; (2) a void function call that appears at the place of a statement, in which case it must return `regular`; this is the only allowed expression that can appear at the place of a statement. Arguments are evaluated *right-to-left*.

– **Opcode execution expression:**  $op(\vec{M})$ . These are calls to dialect-specific instructions external to Yul. Like function calls, arguments are evaluated right-to-left and return zero, one, or multiple values. Unlike function calls, opcodes may return exceptional values which form part of the dialect, not named by the Yul specification. We will treat them as abnormal program exit values in our small-step semantics in the following section.

*Example 1.* To illustrate the source-level language, consider a naive recursive implementation of a Fibonacci term generator. Note that in Yul double forward slashes are comments.

```
{ // Function that computes Fibonacci via naive recursion
  function fibonacci_rec(n) -> result {
    if lt(n,3) {
      result := 1
    }
    if gt(n,2) {
      result := add(fibonacci_rec(sub(n,1)), fibonacci_rec(sub(n,2)))
    }
  } // Call Fibonacci with 10
  let fib_10 := fibonacci_rec(10)
  mstore(0x00, fib_10)
}
```

In the program above, function `fibonacci_rec` computes the  $n$ -th Fibonacci number, where `lt/gt`, `add/sub` and `mstore` are comparison, arithmetic and memory instructions respectively. These are opcodes in the EVM dialect of Yul. Functions do not require a return statement. Instead, the defined output variable `result` is assigned and its value returned at the end. Nesting function calls within opcode/function calls is allowed, and is only constrained by the stack limit of the underlying dialect (in EVM the stack limit is 1024 words). The program computes the 10th Fibonacci term and stores it at position `0x00` in memory.

*Remark 2 (Typing).* Although simple checks are in place in the Solidity compiler, such as for the arity of function arguments/returns, Yul at the moment provides no formal specification for a type system. Its default dialect involves only EVM bytecode operations with a single value type of 256-bit unsigned integers (U256). While the Yul source language involves literals of various kinds (such as hex literals), there is an implicit assumption that these are appropriately translated into values of the underlying dialect—e.g. U256 for the EVM dialect.

*Remark 3 (Dialects).* As mentioned in the Introduction, because Yul is meant to be target-independent, it is designed to be modular with regards to multiple so-called dialects. Each dialect in Yul would in principle be defined in relation to the specific back-end bytecode that it is meant to compile into. For this purpose, dialects amount to a collection of machine opcodes that remain after excluding those associated with control flow and variable management, and the respective value types used by said opcodes. Thus, while we use `tt` and `ff` values in our semantics, these do not necessarily represent boolean values; instead they are placeholders for whichever values are considered true and false in a given dialect. For instance, in the EVM dialect, zero represents `ff` while non-zero values are considered `tt`. This is a conceptually simple mapping that entails a variety of subtle behaviours one has to be careful about in the EVM (e.g. negating a "true" value does not make it a "false" one, as negation is bit-wise and could produce another non-zero value).

### 3 Yul Semantics

In this section we present big- and small-step semantics for Yul. We shall present them together, grouped thematically under rules for blocks, variable manipulation, branching statements, loops, and expressions. For small-step semantics specifically, we additionally define top-level rules that carry around the evaluation contexts and handle external opcode instructions.

For both semantics, we shall use configurations of the form:

$$\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle$$

with the following components:

- **Statement**  $S$  (or *term*) being evaluated. Statements are drawn from an extended *operational syntax* defined in Fig. 2 (top), and discussed further below.
- **Global environment**  $G$  that is external to the semantics of Yul itself, and in the context of smart contracts is meant to contain the state of the blockchain, the data of external calls to a smart contract, etc.;  $G$  will be passed as state by the semantics of Yul and may change only by calls to dialect opcodes.
- **Local state**  $L$  of all variables. This is a dictionary  $L : x \mapsto v$ . All variables in scope for the term being evaluated will be in  $L$ .
- **Namespace**  $\mathcal{N}$  of all functions visible to the term being evaluated. This is like a function repository  $\mathcal{N} : x \mapsto (\vec{x}_i, \vec{x}_o, S_b)$  for all the functions in scope.

We mentioned that statements require an extended syntax; **regular** represents successful completion of a statement. Specific to the small-step semantics (cf. Def. 6) are special statements that arise from certain reductions.

- **Block scoping:**  $\{\vec{S}\}_L^{\mathcal{N}}$ . This is used to implement the scoping rules for blocks and are distinct from source-level blocks  $\{S^*\}$ . Here  $\mathcal{N}$  records functions and  $L$  variables in scope before entering a block, needed when reinstating this scope after exiting the block.
- **Break/continue catching:**  $\llbracket S \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} / \llbracket S \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}}$ . These catch **break** and **continue** statements respectively within loop body blocks.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Stmt: } S &::= \dots \mid \text{regular} \mid \mathcal{M} \mid \{\vec{S}\}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid \llbracket S \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid \llbracket S \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} \mid \langle\langle S \rangle\rangle_L^{\vec{x}} \\
\text{Exp: } M &::= \dots \mid \langle\vec{v}\rangle \\
\text{Mode: } \mathbb{M} &::= \text{break} \mid \text{continue} \mid \text{leave} \mid \text{regular} \mid \mathcal{M} \\
\text{ExMode: } \mathcal{M} &
\end{aligned}$$


---


$$\begin{aligned}
\text{SCxt: } E &::= [\cdot] \mid \{E, \vec{S}\}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid \text{let } \vec{x} := E \mid \vec{x} := E \mid E_{\text{Exp}} \mid \llbracket E \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} \mid \llbracket E \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid \text{if } E_{\text{Exp}} \{S^*\} \\
&\quad \mid \text{switch } E_{\text{Exp}} (\text{case } v \{S^*\})^* \text{default} \{S^*\} \\
\text{ECxt: } E_{\text{Exp}} &::= [\cdot] \mid x(\vec{M}, E_{\text{Exp}}, \vec{v}) \mid \text{op}(\vec{M}, E_{\text{Exp}}, \vec{v}) \mid \langle\langle E \rangle\rangle_L^{\vec{x}}
\end{aligned}$$

**Fig. 2.** Yul operational syntax (omitting constructs shown in Fig. 1).

– **Function call framing:**  $\langle\langle S \rangle\rangle_L^{\vec{x}}$ . These encode function call frames by remembering the  $L$  at call site and the return variables  $\vec{x}$ . At return,  $L$  is used to restrict the domain and ensure correct scoping (similar to blocks) and  $\vec{x}$  is used to retrieve the function return values.

We also extend expressions  $M$  with tuples  $\langle\vec{v}\rangle$ , needed for multi-value assignments and function returns, which are defined when  $|\vec{v}| > 1$ . Finally, we introduce *modes*  $\mathbb{M}$ , as in the Yul specification, which can signal regular termination (*regular*), e.g. of a void function call, *break/continue* modes for for-loops, and *leave* mode for returning early from functions.

Modes also include *external irregular modes*  $\mathcal{M}$  that may be returned by opcode evaluation. These are parametric to the Yul semantics and depend on the specific dialect implemented; e.g. in the EVM dialect, such modes may be generated by opcodes signalling exhaustion of gas. We do not use external error modes in big-step semantics rules which define only successful executions.

In Fig. 2 (bottom) we define statement (SCxt) and expression (ECxt) evaluation contexts for our small-step semantics. Most evaluation contexts are derived in a standard way from the syntax of the language and ensure correct evaluation order in small-step semantics. For example block statements are evaluated left-to-right, whereas function and opcode call arguments are evaluated right-to-left. The inclusion of function call contexts  $\langle\langle E \rangle\rangle_L^{\vec{x}}$  encodes a call stack in our small-step semantics. As functions have a fresh variable scope when they are called, the surrounding scope  $L$  of the caller must be recorded and reinstated at function return. The return variables must also be recorded to be returned to the caller.

In the following subsections we present the rules of the big- and small-step semantics of Yul, grouped by the kind of term they handle. These rules precisely define the predicates of the next two definitions.

**Definition 4 (Big-step semantics).** *We define a big-step semantics on successful executions that do not result in external irregular modes. We write*

$$\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$$

*for the top-level big-step evaluation of  $S$  that produces a successful execution. We additionally define variants thereof for intermediate evaluations:*



– the evaluation of sequences of statements comprising blocks

$$\langle \vec{S} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{seq}} \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$$

– the evaluation of expressions, which result in  $S' \in \{v, \langle \vec{v} \rangle, \text{regular}\}$

$$\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle S' \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$$

The above are concretely defined by the top rules in Fig. 3 to Fig. 7.

*Remark 5.* Although it would have been possible to define big-step rules to deal with propagation of external irregular modes, we follow standard practice and define  $\Downarrow$  only on successful computation, excluding irregular modes. We do handle these modes in the small-step semantics, which more closely specifies an interpreter for the language.

**Definition 6 (Small-step semantics).** We write

$$\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle S' \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$$

for a small-step transition in our small-step semantics. When a transition does not change  $G$  (as only opcode execution does) we omit it from the configurations. The reduction rules are shown in the bottom part of Fig. 3 to Fig. 7, with the additional top-level rules:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle E[S] \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle &\rightarrow \langle E[S'] \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \text{ if } \langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle S' \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \\ \langle E[\mathcal{M}] \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle &\rightarrow \langle \mathcal{M} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \end{aligned}$$

The top-level rules decompose the term to an evaluation context with an inner statement in its hole that can either perform a Yul reduction (former rule), or is an irregular return mode that terminates the program (latter rule). We next present the rules for small- and big-step semantics for each type of term.

### 3.1 Block Statements

The first rules are those for blocks, shown in Fig. 3. Blocks sequentially execute statements and extend the namespace of variables and functions. In the big-step semantics we handle function scoping in the BLOCK rule, where the existing function namespace  $\mathcal{N}$  is extended by the functions defined in the block (given by  $\mathcal{N}_1 = \text{funs}(\{S_1..S_n\})$ ), and block statements are evaluated under  $\mathcal{N} \uplus \mathcal{N}_1$ . Moreover, any new variables defined within the scope (discussed in the following subsection), are pruned in the resulting configuration of the rule by  $L_1 \upharpoonright L$ , which restricts the variable environment  $L_1$  to only the variables in  $L$ . Rules SEQEMPTY, SEQREG, and SEQIRREG handle the sequencing of statement execution, with the last one skipping all remaining statements in a sequence if a Yul mode other than **regular** is encountered, which causes early exit from a loop iteration, an entire loop, or a function body. Function declarations are ignored by rule FUNDEF, as these are handled by the first rule.

On the small-step side, we make use of a context  $\{\dots\}_L^{\mathcal{N}}$  that remembers the variable and function namespaces to handle scoping. This context is introduced



$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\mathcal{N}_1 = \text{funs}(\{S_1..S_n\}) \quad \langle S_1, \dots, S_n \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \uplus \mathcal{N}_1 \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{seq}} \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \uplus \mathcal{N}_1 \rangle}{\langle \{S_1..S_n\} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_1; L_1 \uparrow L; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{BLOCK} \\
\\
\frac{}{\langle \varepsilon \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{seq}} \langle \text{regular} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{SEQEMPTY} \\
\\
\frac{\langle S_1 \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \langle \vec{S} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{seq}} \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle}{\langle S_1, \vec{S} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{seq}} \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{SEQREG} \\
\\
\frac{\langle S_1 \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \mathbb{M} \in \{\text{break, continue, leave}\}}{\langle S_1, \vec{S} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{seq}} \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{SEQIRREG} \\
\\
\frac{}{\langle \text{function } x(\vec{y}) \rightarrow \vec{z} S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FUNDEF} \\
\hline
\langle \{S_1..S_n\} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \{S_1, \dots, S_n\}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \uplus \mathcal{N}_1 \rangle \quad \mathcal{N}_1 = \text{funs}(\{S_1..S_n\}), n > 0 \\
\langle \{\} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
\langle \{\text{regular}, \vec{S}\}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid L_1; \mathcal{N}_1 \rangle \rightarrow \langle \{\vec{S}\}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid L_1; \mathcal{N}_1 \rangle \quad \vec{S} \neq \epsilon \\
\langle \{\text{regular}\}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid L_1; \mathcal{N}_1 \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid L_1 \uparrow L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
\langle \{\mathbb{M}, \vec{S}\}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid L_1; \mathcal{N}_1 \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid L_1 \uparrow L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \mathbb{M} \in \{\text{break, continue, leave}\} \\
\langle \text{function } x(\vec{y}) \vec{z} S \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle
\end{array}$$

**Fig. 3.** Big-step (top) and small-step (bottom) block semantics.

when a block is entered and removed (with the appropriate scope restriction) when exiting the block. Note that, in this semantics and the Yul specification, functions do not need to be declared before being called, as long as they are in the same, or surrounding, block of the call.

*Remark 7 (Block optimisation).* It is sound to simplify any  $\{\dots \{\{\cdot\}_{L_1}^{\mathcal{N}}\}_{L_2}^{\mathcal{N}} \dots\}_{L_n}^{\mathcal{N}}$  to  $\{\cdot\}_L^{\mathcal{N}}$ , provided  $\text{dom}(L_1) = \dots = \text{dom}(L_n)$  (cf. Corollary 21), avoiding redundant block-exit reductions. However, this may not provide a performance gain as calculating domain equality can be costlier than the additional reductions.

### 3.2 Variable Manipulation Statements

Single- and multi-value variable declaration are handled by the rules in Fig. 4. Assignment rules are similar, with the only differences being that the statement is missing the let-keyword, and the side condition in all rules requires  $x \in \text{dom}(L)$  (or  $\vec{x} \in \text{dom}(L)$ ) instead of  $x \notin \text{dom}(L)$  (resp.,  $\vec{x} \notin \text{dom}(L)$ ). These rules behave as expected: they add or update  $L$  bindings. Unlike functions, variables must be declared before use. Only function and opcode calls may return multiple values.

### 3.3 Branching Statements

Control branching in Yul is done by conditional and switch statements. Conditionals make use of `tt` and `ff`, which are not necessarily boolean values (as Yul

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle v \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad x \notin \text{dom}(L)}{\langle \text{let } x := M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G_1; L_1[x \mapsto v]; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{VARDECL} \\
\\
\frac{\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \langle \vec{v} \rangle \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \vec{x} \notin \text{dom}(L)}{\langle \text{let } \vec{x} := M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G_1; L_1[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{v}]; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{TUPLEDECL} \\
\hline
\langle \text{let } \vec{x} := \langle \vec{v} \rangle \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid L[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{v}]; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \vec{x} \notin \text{dom}(L) \\
\langle \text{let } x := v \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid L[x \mapsto v]; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad x \notin \text{dom}(L)
\end{array}$$

**Fig. 4.** Big-step (top) and small-step (bottom) declaration semantics. Similar rules for assignments (e.g.  $\vec{x} := \langle \vec{v} \rangle$ , with  $\vec{x} \in \text{dom}(L)$ ) omitted for economy.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \text{ff} \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle}{\langle \text{if } MS \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{IF} \\
\\
\frac{\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \text{tt} \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \langle S \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle}{\langle \text{if } MS \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{IF} \\
\\
\frac{\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle v \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \langle S_d \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle}{\langle \text{switch } MC_1..C_n \text{ default } S_d \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{SWD} \\
\\
\frac{\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle c_{n+1} \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \langle S_{n+1} \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle}{\langle \text{switch } MC_1..C_{n+1} \text{ default } S_d \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{SWC} \\
\hline
\langle \text{if } \text{ff } S \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \langle \text{if } \text{tt } S \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle S \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
\langle \text{switch } v C_1..C_n \text{ default } S_d \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle S_d \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
\langle \text{switch } c_{n+1} C_1..C_{n+1} \text{ default } S_d \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle S_{n+1} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle
\end{array}$$

**Fig. 5.** Big-step (top) and small-step (bottom) branching semantics. For switch rules we assume side conditions:  $C_i = \text{case } c_i S_i$  and  $v, c_{n+1} \notin \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$ .

is parametric in the dialect types) but, instead, placeholders for values that are to be interpreted correspondingly. We assume a dialect comes equipped with predicates that let us identify which values are `tt` and `ff`.

The rules for these statements are given in Fig. 5. On the big-step side, we have standard `IF` and `IF` rules for conditionals, and `SWD` and `SWC` for case-switching. All switch statements have a default case that is called if the deciding expression  $M$  evaluates to  $v$  which does not match any  $c_i$  in the listed cases. The same behaviour is captured by standard small-step rules. Note that source-level syntax requires inner statements in conditional and switch statements be (potentially empty) blocks, with their own scope.

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\langle \{S_1 \dots S_n \text{ for}\{ \} MS_p S_b\} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad n > 0}{\langle \text{for}\{S_1 \dots S_n\} MS_p S_b \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FORINIT} \\
\\
\frac{\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \text{ff} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle}{\langle \text{for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FORFALSE} \\
\\
\frac{\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \text{tt} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \langle S_b \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M}_{lb} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle}{\langle \text{for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M}'_{lb} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FORHALT1} \\
\\
\frac{\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \text{tt} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \langle S_b \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M}_{\neq lb} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \langle S_p \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{leave} \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle}{\langle \text{for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{leave} \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FORHALT2} \\
\\
\frac{\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \text{tt} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \langle S_b \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M}_{\neq lb} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \langle S_p \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \langle \text{for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_4; L_4; \mathcal{N} \rangle}{\langle \text{for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_4; L_4; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FORLOOP} \\
\hline
\langle \text{for}\{S_1 \dots S_n\} MS_p S_b \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \{S_1 \dots S_n \text{ for}\{ \} MS_p S_b\} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad n > 0 \\
\langle \text{for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \text{if } M \{ \llbracket S_b \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} S_p \text{ for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \rrbracket \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
\langle \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \mathbb{M} \in \{\text{regular}, \text{break}, \text{leave}\} \\
\langle \llbracket \text{continue} \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
\langle \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \mathbb{M} \in \{\text{regular}, \text{leave}\} \\
\langle \llbracket \text{break} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle
\end{array}$$

**Fig. 6.** Big-step (top) and small-step (bottom) loop semantics. Side conditions:  $(\mathbb{M}_{lb}, \mathbb{M}'_{lb}) \in \{(\text{leave}, \text{leave}), (\text{break}, \text{regular})\}$ , whereas  $\mathbb{M}_{\neq lb} \in \{\text{regular}, \text{continue}\}$ .

### 3.4 Loop Statements

Loops in Yul consist of four parts: an initialisation block, a condition, a post-iteration block, and a loop-body block. In well-formed Yul programs `break` and `continue` may appear only in a loop body. On the other hand, `leave` may appear in any part of a loop, so long as the loop itself occurs inside a function. The semantics for loops is given in Fig. 6.

Here we once again make use of the semantics of blocks, this time to handle the sequencing of loops. `FORINIT` refactors the initialisation block out of the loop and places the whole loop in a new block that prefixes the initialisation statements — the small-step rule mirrors this exactly. `FORHALT2` handles `break` and `leave` statements within the loop body, while `FORHALT1` handles `leave` statements within the post-iteration. Note that `continue` is handled implicitly by the big-step rules; we piggyback off `SEQIRREG` in Fig. 3 to exit out of the loop body if `continue`— i.e. an irregular mode — is encountered. The small-step side handles irregular modes more explicitly: special evaluation contexts  $\llbracket \dots \rrbracket_{\text{brk}}$  and  $\llbracket \dots \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}}$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{}{\langle x \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle L(x) \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{IDENT} \\
\\
\frac{\langle M_n \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle v_n \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \dots \langle M_1 \mid G_{n-1}; L_{n-1}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle v_1 \mid G_n; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \langle S_b \mid G_n; L_f; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G''; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle}{\langle f(M_1, \dots, M_n) \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \langle L'(z_1), \dots, L'(z_m) \rangle \mid G''; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FUNCALL} \\
\\
\frac{\langle M_n \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle v_n \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \dots \langle M_1 \mid G_{n-1}; L_{n-1}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle v_1 \mid G_n; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \langle \text{op}(v_1, \dots, v_n) \mid G_n \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{opc}} \langle v'_1, \dots, v'_m \mid G'' \rangle}{\langle \text{op}(M_1, \dots, M_n) \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \langle v'_1, \dots, v'_m \rangle \mid G''; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{OPCCALL} \\
\\
\hline
\langle x \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle L(x) \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \qquad x \in L \\
\langle f(\vec{v}) \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \langle S_b \rangle_L^{\vec{z}} \mid L_f; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
\langle \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle_L^{z_1, \dots, z_m} \mid L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \langle L'(z_1), \dots, L'(z_m) \rangle \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \mathbb{M} \in \{\text{leave, regular}\} \\
\langle \text{op}(\vec{v}) \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle S' \mid G'; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \qquad \text{if } \langle \text{op}(\vec{v}) \mid G \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{opc}} \langle S' \mid G' \rangle \\
\qquad \qquad \qquad \text{and } S' \in \{ \langle \vec{v} \rangle, \mathcal{M} \}
\end{array}$$

**Fig. 7.** Big-step (top) and small-step (bottom) expression semantics. Side-conditions:  $\mathcal{N}(f) = ((y_1, \dots, y_n), (z_1, \dots, z_m), S_b)$ ,  $L_f = \{(y_1, \dots, y_n) \mapsto (v_1, \dots, v_n)\} \uplus \{(z_1, \dots, z_m) \mapsto 0\}$ . For uniformity, we slightly abuse tuple notation to write  $\langle v \rangle = v$  and  $\langle \rangle = \text{regular}$ .

are used to encode the frames that check for **break** and **continue** respectively. Lastly, note that while **FORLOOP** directly executes the loop body and otherwise breaks with **FORFALSE**, the small-step equivalent further leverages the semantics of conditional statements to encode this behaviour.

*Remark 8 (Break optimisation).* Multiple small-step unrollings of a for-loop result in statements containing the pattern  $\llbracket \{ \{ \{ \dots \{ \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \}_{L_n} \dots \} \}_{\text{brk}} \}_{L_2} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \}_{L_1} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}}$  with  $\text{dom}(L_1) = \dots = \text{dom}(L_n)$ . Using our semantics we prove that such statements can be simplified by dropping the inner break and block contexts (cf. Cor. 22 and Lem. 20). This has brought significant speedup in the implementation of our interpreter. That is, for any  $E$  that contains only interleavings of  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{\text{brk}}$  and empty  $\{ \cdot \}_{L_j}^{\mathcal{N}}$  contexts with the same  $\mathcal{N}$  and domain in all  $L_j$ 's:

$$\begin{aligned}
\llbracket \llbracket E \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \mathbb{M} \mid L''; \mathcal{N}'' \rangle &\text{ iff } \langle \llbracket E[S'] \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \mathbb{M} \mid L''; \mathcal{N}'' \rangle \\
\langle \{ E \{ S' \}_{L_2}^{\mathcal{N}} \}_{L_1}^{\mathcal{N}} \mid L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \mathbb{M} \mid L''; \mathcal{N}'' \rangle &\text{ iff } \langle \{ E[S'] \}_{L_1}^{\mathcal{N}} \mid L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \mathbb{M} \mid L''; \mathcal{N}'' \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

### 3.5 Expressions

Finally, we define the semantics of expressions, handling variable look-up, function calls and opcode calls. Because of this, they either return values, **regular**, or an external irregular mode  $\mathcal{M}$  if handled. The rules are given in Fig. 7.

**IDENT** and its small-step counterpart behave as expected; they look up the value of  $x$  within  $L$ . Function calls on the other hand are less standard. Instead of substitution for function application, calls assign in  $L$  the correct value for every

argument and then leverage the semantics of blocks to set up the namespace. Similarly, for returns, instead of a return statement, functions assign to the return variables and look up their values in the local  $L$ , again leveraging block semantics to clean up the namespace. Note that in `FUNCALL`, functions may return either a sequence of values if there are return variables, or `regular` if the function is not expected to return anything (analogous to `void` functions in C-like languages). `OPCCALL` mirrors function calls. Note that we do not handle external modes in the big-step semantics. For the small-step transitions involving function calls we introduce a special context  $(\dots)_L^{\vec{z}}$ . Much like with other special contexts introduced in the small-step semantics, its purpose is to encode within the evaluation context all the frames that form the call stack, including the local state  $L$  to reinstate and the return variables  $\vec{z}$ .

*Remark 9 (Void return and modes).* The evaluation function provided in the Yul specification [38] is undefined for void function calls. This introduces ambiguity in the intended details of the Yul semantics. We decided to resolve this in a consistent manner to [38], making `modes` a subset of statements, produced by evaluation, and for `regular` to be returned by void functions. Since such functions are called in block statements, it was necessary that they return `regular` in order for the evaluation of subsequent block statements to occur.

## 4 Semantic Equivalence

Here we show that the big-step and small-step semantics are equivalent. A necessary result is a congruence lemma for small-step semantics.

**Lemma 10 (Congruence).** *Given any evaluation context  $E$  and a reduction sequence  $\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle S' \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$  then it is the case that:*

$$\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle S' \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \implies \langle E[S] \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle E[S'] \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$$

*Proof.* This follows by induction on the length of the reduction.  $\square$

**Theorem 11 (Semantics Equivalence).** *Given statement  $S$  in source syntax, global environment  $G$ , local state  $L$ , and function namespace  $\mathcal{N}$ , then, for a configuration  $\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle$ , statements (1) and (2) below are equivalent.*

- (1)  $\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$
- (2)  $\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \text{regular} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$

*Proof.* We show something stronger, whereby reduction is not necessarily to `regular` but to some  $S_{ret}$  taken from:  $S_{ret} ::= v \mid \langle \vec{v} \rangle \mid \mathbb{M}$ .

The proof of the forward direction is by structural induction on the derivation of the reduction (App. B.1) and the reverse is by induction on the number of steps in the reduction sequence (App. B.2). Here we show the case of function application. We refer to Lem. 10 by (CG).

**Forward direction.** Let  $S = f(M_1, \dots, M_n)$  and suppose  $\mathcal{N}(f) = (\vec{y}, \vec{z}, S_b)$  and  $L_f = \{\vec{y} \mapsto \vec{v}\} \uplus \{\{\vec{z}\} \mapsto 0\}$ . We assume (1):

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \langle M_n \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle v_n \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ \dots \langle M_1 \mid G_{n-1}; L_{n-1}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle v_1 \mid G_n; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ \langle S_b \mid G_n; L_f; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{array}}{\langle f(M_1, \dots, M_n) \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle S_{ret} \mid G'; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FUNCALL}$$

with  $S_{ret}$  being:  $L'(z_1)$  if  $|\vec{z}| = 1$ ;  $\langle L'(z_1), \dots, L'(z_m) \rangle$  if  $|\vec{z}| > 1$ ; **regular** if  $|\vec{z}| = 0$ . We then obtain (2) as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \langle f(M_1, \dots, M_n) \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle & \\ \rightarrow^* \langle f(M_1, \dots, M_{n-1}, v_n) \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle & \text{by CG and IH} \langle M_n \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ \dots & \\ \rightarrow^* \langle f(v_1, \dots, v_n) \mid G_n; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle & \text{by CG and IH} \langle M_1 \mid G_{n-1}; L_{n-1}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ \rightarrow \langle \langle S_b \rangle_{L_n}^{\vec{z}} \mid G_n; L_f; \mathcal{N} \rangle & \text{where } \mathcal{N}(f), L_f \text{ as above} \\ \rightarrow^* \langle \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle_{L_n}^{\vec{z}} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle & \text{by CG and IH} \langle S_b \mid G_n; L_f; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ \rightarrow \langle S_{ret} \mid G'; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle & \end{array}$$

**Reverse direction.** For a term  $S = f(M_1, \dots, M_n)$ , an evaluation to  $S_{ret}$  as in (2) requires a trace:

$$\begin{array}{l} \langle f(M_1, \dots, M_n) \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle f(v_1, \dots, v_n) \mid G_n; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ \rightarrow^* \langle \langle S_b \rangle_{L_n}^{\vec{z}} \mid G_n; L_f; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle_{L_n}^{\vec{z}} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle S_{ret} \mid G'; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{array}$$

with  $\mathcal{N}(x), L_f, S_{ret}$  satisfying the same conditions as in the forward direction above, and with intermediate steps:

$$\langle M_i \mid G_{n-i}; L_{n-i}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle v_i \mid G_{n-i+1}; L_{n-i+1}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad (\text{A}_i)$$

$$\langle S_b \mid G_n; L_f; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad (\text{B})$$

To obtain (1), by IH on (A<sub>i</sub>):  $\langle M_i \mid G_{n-i}; L_{n-i}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle v_i \mid G_{n-i+1}; L_{n-i+1}; \mathcal{N} \rangle$ . Next, by IH on (B):  $\langle S_b \mid G_n; L_f; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle$ . We therefore obtain by FUNCALL:  $\langle f(M_1, \dots, M_n) \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle S_{ret} \mid G'; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle$ .  $\square$

## 5 Implementation

We implemented YULTRACER [27, 28], a prototype interpreter based on our operational semantics for Yul that is parametric on dialect implementations. Currently, a partial implementation of the Shanghai upgrade (Solidity 0.8.20 to 0.8.23) of the EVM execution specifications [16] is provided as its sole dialect. We provide opcodes for the following categories: Arithmetic, Bitwise, Comparison, Control-flow, Memory, Stack, and Storage. We omit the implementation of opcodes that are not listed in the official documentation for Yul [38] under version 0.8.23, but otherwise adapt the Python specification to our use as faithfully as

possible. YULTRACER implements our small-step semantics in the style of CEK machines [20] and is written using OCaml. Modularity for dialects is achieved using functors: a module signature is provided for dialects to satisfy, which are then used to instantiate any concrete implementation of the interpreter. Lastly, we also provide in the EVM dialect a partial implementation of gas consumption. Since Yul replaces some operations that consume gas but does not provide an official model for gas consumption, we do not calculate gas consumption with perfect accuracy, but instead attempt to accurately compute it for the subset of opcodes provided.

We evaluate our interpreter using custom tests—1263 Lines of Code (LoC)—and a subset of tests found in the Solidity compiler repository [17]—269 LoC. From the 50 files found under `test/libyul/yullnterpreterTests` in the Solidity repository (commit 2b2c76c), we kept 19 files that do not make use of unimplemented EVM instructions: opcodes for inter-contract communication in the System category; those in the Block, Environment or Log categories; the opcode for Keccak, which is implemented but unused as it uses a model that requires symbolic execution; or opcodes implemented in the Cancun upgrade (i.e. Solidity 0.8.24) such as those for transient memory or `mcopy`. From the 19 remaining tests, we mark and omit 3 tests that do not behave according to the official specifications of the EVM; these are: `access_large_memory_offsets.yul`, which under standard operation would exceed the gas limit when trying to access large offsets but does not; `expr_nesting_depth_exceeded.yul`, which imposes a nesting limit on expressions that is not specified in the Yul documentation; and `hex_literals.yul`, which uses underscores `_` in hexadecimal strings, not allowed by the official Yul grammar. For our own custom examples, we implemented two categories of programs: sequence generators (426 LoC) and sorting algorithms (837 LoC). For the former, we have generators for Catalan numbers, the Heighway dragon curve, Fibonacci numbers, Pell numbers, Prime numbers, and the Thue–Morse sequence. For the latter we have implementations of bubble, heap, insertion, quick and shell sort on arrays of 6, 300 and 1000 items. These were chosen as non-trivial algorithms with standard implementations that we can compare to for reference that also make use of a range of Yul features and EVM opcodes while testing YULTRACER’s performance.

All examples were executed on a laptop featuring an 8-core Intel Core i7-8665U CPU with 32 GiB of RAM running Ubuntu 23.04. The interpreter was compiled with the OCaml 4.10.0 compiler using the Dune build system. We measure for each batch of examples a three-trial average total execution time of 0.478s for all 8 sequence generator files, 31.960s for all 12 sorting algorithm files, and 2.932s for all 16 of the Solidity tests (including an infinite loop set to time out at 2s). YULTRACER produced the expected output for all programs.

## 6 Related Work

As discussed in the Introduction, the body of work on formalising Yul involves mechanisations in e.g. Dafny [11, 12], the K-framework [18], Isabelle/HOL [3], Lean [34], and ACL2 [25]. To our knowledge, there is no peer-reviewed tool-independent presentation of a formal semantics for Yul. Closely related is the



area of formalising Solidity, for which a more substantial body of work exists: e.g. [32] mathematically presents a calculus to reason about Solidity smart contracts and then implements and mechanically verifies its soundness in Isabelle/HOL; [10] presents a shallow embedding of Solidity in F\*; [14] presents an operational semantics for a subset of Solidity and presents an abstract model for memory; [40] formalises another subset of Solidity by presenting a big-step semantics; [24] presents a semantics for the memory model of Solidity by mapping a fragment of Solidity to SMT-based constructs; [31] implements a denotational semantics for a subset of Solidity in 1500 lines of Isabelle. Also relevant are specifications for the EVM, which are necessary to implement the EVM dialect for Yul, such as: the Ethereum execution specification in Python [16]; other formalisation work such as [23], which presents the first complete small-step semantics of EVM bytecode and formalises it in F\*; and [13], which presents a complete and formal specification in Dafny. Lastly, formalisation efforts are also common practice outside smart contracts, such as with the Glasgow Haskell Compiler (GHC) intermediate language Core which implements System FC [39] and features a maintained formal specification [35].

## 7 Conclusions

In this paper, we have presented an operational semantics for Yul. We first defined a source-level abstract syntax constructed by inspecting the grammar specified in [38] (Sec. 2), which we subsequently extended with constructs necessary for evaluation (Sec. 3). We then presented big- and small-step semantics, constructed by carefully inspecting the pseudocode evaluation function provided in [38], and supplied a proof of semantic equivalence between them (Thm. 11). Lastly, we presented YULTRACER, an interpreter that implements our small-step semantics for a subset of the EVM dialect based on the Shanghai upgrade [16]. We evaluated our implementation against tests from the Solidity repository [17] and our own ones based on standard sequence generators and sorting algorithms.

We believe our work offers multiple advantages. Being in standard mathematical notation, and free of implementation or formalisation considerations, our semantics can serve to unify various extant tool-specific formalisations and verify any current and future implementations, while it can also be directly used in mathematical proofs, especially those involving the development and verification of language properties. Moreover, we provide an exhaustive specification for statements that irons out issues with ambiguity arising from under-specification of the semantics; e.g. function returns with no return variables. Lastly, we anticipate that a semantics such as ours will aid the development of future theories for Yul. We shall discuss this last point in more detail next.

This document focuses only the semantics of Yul statements. As such, we leave a detailed discussion of the EVM dialect and object semantics for future work. In particular, the EVM semantics includes behaviours which may be of technical interest, such as instructions related to transactions and interaction with the blockchain, as well as inter-contract communication. YULTRACER and our semantics work towards the development of symbolic execution tools and theories developed directly in Yul, avoiding low-level complexities of EVM bytecode

and the feature-rich, evolving syntax of Solidity; in particular those which combine symbolic execution with game semantics (e.g. [29] and [26]) to model higher-order interactions of smart contracts relevant to reentrancy exploits. Lastly, our semantics could lead to soundness proofs for a future Yul type system.

*Acknowledgements:* This work was supported in part by: Science Foundation Ireland under grant number 13/RC/2094\_2; the Cisco University Research Program Fund, a corporate advised fund of Silicon Valley Community Foundation; and Ethereum Foundation grant FY23-1127. For the purpose of Open Access, the authors have applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

## References

1. Smart contract vulnerabilities (SCV) list, <https://github.com/sirhashalot/SCV-List>, accessed 6 June 2024
2. Oyente (Mar 2017), <https://github.com/enzymefinance/oyente/releases/tag/0.2.7>
3. Yul-Isabelle: Executable Formal Semantics of Yul (2021), <https://github.com/mmalvarez/Yul-Isabelle/tree/master>, accessed 24 June 2024
4. Manticore (Feb 2022), <https://github.com/trailofbits/manticore/releases/tag/0.3.7>
5. Echidna (Mar 2024), <https://github.com/crytic/echidna/releases/tag/v2.2.3>
6. Gambit: Mutant Generation for Solidity (May 2024), <https://github.com/Certora/gambit/releases/tag/v1.0.5>
7. Mythril (Mar 2024), <https://github.com/Consensys/mythril/releases/tag/v0.24.8>
8. Slither (Jun 2024), <https://github.com/crytic/slither/releases/tag/0.10.3>
9. solhint (May 2024), <https://github.com/protofire/solhint/releases/tag/v5.0.1>
10. Bhargavan, K., Delignat-Lavaud, A., Fournet, C., Gollamudi, A., Gonthier, G., Kobeissi, N., Kulatova, N., Rastogi, A., Sibut-Pinote, T., Swamy, N., Zanella-Béguelin, S.: Formal verification of smart contracts: Short paper. In: Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Workshop on Programming Languages and Analysis for Security. p. 91–96. PLAS '16, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2993600.2993611>
11. Cassez, F.: Formal and executable semantics of Yul in Dafny (oct 2023), <https://hackmd.io/@FranckC/BJz02K4Za>, accessed 24 June 2024
12. Cassez, F.: yul-dafny (oct 2023), <https://github.com/franck44/yul-dafny>, accessed 24 June 2024
13. Cassez, F., Fuller, J., Ghale, M.K., Pearce, D.J., Quiles, H.M.A.: Formal and executable semantics of the ethereum virtual machine in dafny. In: Chechik, M., Katoen, J.P., Leucker, M. (eds.) Formal Methods. pp. 571–583. Springer (2023)
14. Crosara, M., Centurino, G., Arceri, V.: Towards an operational semantics for solidity (2019), <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:249983842>
15. Crystal Intelligence: Adolescent anarchy: Thirteen years of crypto crimes unveiled, <https://crystalintelligence.com/rohirov/2024/06/Crystal-Intelligence-Thirteen-Years-of-Crypto-Crimes-Unveiled.p>, accessed 25 June 2024
16. ethereum.org: Ethereum execution client specifications, <https://github.com/ethereum/execution-specs.git>, accessed 14 June 2024
17. ethereum.org: The Solidity contract-oriented programming language, <https://github.com/ethereum/solidity.git>, accessed 13 June 2024
18. ethereum.org: Yul-K (2019), <https://github.com/ethereum/Yul-K>, accessed 24 June 2024

19. Feist, J., Greico, G., Groce, A.: Slither: A static analysis framework for smart contracts (05 2019). <https://doi.org/10.1109/WETSEB.2019.00008>
20. Felleisen, M., Friedman, D.P.: Control operators, the secd-machine, and the  $\lambda$ -calculus. In: Wirsing, M. (ed.) *Formal Description of Programming Concepts - III: Proceedings of the IFIP TC 2/WG 2.2 Working Conference on Formal Description of Programming Concepts - III*, Ebberup, Denmark, 25-28 August 1986. pp. 193–222. North-Holland (1987)
21. Grech, N., Lagouvardos, S., Tsatiris, I., Smaragdakis, Y.: Elipmoc: advanced decompilation of ethereum smart contracts. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **6**(OOPSLA1) (apr 2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3527321>
22. Grieco, G., Song, W., Cygan, A., Feist, J., Groce, A.: Echidna: effective, usable, and fast fuzzing for smart contracts. pp. 557–560 (07 2020). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3395363.3404366>
23. Grishchenko, I., Maffei, M., Schneidewind, C.: A semantic framework for the security analysis of ethereum smart contracts. In: Bauer, L., Küsters, R. (eds.) *Principles of Security and Trust*. pp. 243–269. Springer (2018)
24. Hajdu, Á., Jovanović, D.: SMT-friendly formalization of the Solidity memory model. In: Müller, P. (ed.) *Programming Languages and Systems*. pp. 224–250. Springer (2020)
25. Kestrel Institute: Yul Directory, Kestrel Books in ACL2 Repository (2023), <https://github.com/acl2/acl2/tree/master/books/kestrel/yul>, accessed 24 June 2024
26. Koutavas, V., Lin, Y., Tzevelekos, N.: From bounded checking to verification of equivalence via symbolic up-to techniques. In: *TACAS. LNCS*, vol. 13244, pp. 178–195. Springer (2022). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-99527-0\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-99527-0_10)
27. Lin, Y.Y.: LaifsV1/YulTracer: Alpha 0.1.1: Parametric Parser and Main (Jun 2024). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12511493>, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12511493>
28. Lin, Y.Y.: Yultracer: Alpha 0.1.1 (artefact) (Jun 2024). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12588076>, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12588076>
29. Lin, Y., Tzevelekos, N.: Symbolic execution game semantics. In: *FSCD. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik* (2020)
30. Luu, L., Chu, D., Olickel, H., Saxena, P., Hobor, A.: Making smart contracts smarter. In: Weippl, E.R., Katzenbeisser, S., Kruegel, C., Myers, A.C., Halevi, S. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, Vienna, Austria, October 24-28, 2016. pp. 254–269. ACM (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2976749.2978309>
31. Marmsoler, D., Brucker, A.D.: A denotational semantics of Solidity in Isabelle/HOL. In: Calinescu, R., Păsăreanu, C.S. (eds.) *Software Engineering and Formal Methods*. pp. 403–422. Springer (2021)
32. Marmsoler, D., Thornton, B.: Sscal: A calculus for solidity smart contracts. In: Ferreira, C., Willemse, T.A.C. (eds.) *Software Engineering and Formal Methods*. pp. 184–204. Springer (2023)
33. Mossberg, M., Manzano, F., Hennenfent, E., Groce, A., Grieco, G., Feist, J., Brunson, T., Dinaburg, A.: Manticore: A user-friendly symbolic execution framework for binaries and smart contracts. pp. 1186–1189 (11 2019). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE.2019.00133>
34. NethermindEth: Yul IR specification in Lean (2021), <https://github.com/NethermindEth/Yul-Specification>, accessed 24 June 2024

35. Peyton Jones, S.: System FC, as implemented in GHC (May), <https://gitlab.haskell.org/ghc/ghc/-/blob/master/docs/core-spec/core-spec.pdf>, accessed 27 June 2024
36. Sharma, N., Sharma, S.: A survey of mythril, a smart contract security analysis tool for evm bytecode **13**, 51003–51010 (12 2022)
37. Solidity Team: List of known bugs - Solidity 0.8.27 documentation, <https://docs.soliditylang.org/en/develop/bugs.html>, accessed 6 June 2024
38. Solidity Team: Yul - Solidity 0.8.27 documentation, <https://docs.soliditylang.org/en/latest/yul.html>, accessed 6 June 2024
39. Sulzmann, M., Chakravarty, M., Peyton Jones, S., Donnelly, K.: System f with type equality coercions. In: ACM SIGPLAN International Workshop on Types in Language Design and Implementation (TLDI'07). pp. 53–66. ACM (January 2007), <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/system-f-with-type-equality-coercions/>
40. Zakrzewski, J.: Towards verification of ethereum smart contracts: A formalization of core of solidity. In: Piskac, R., Rümmer, P. (eds.) Verified Software. Theories, Tools, and Experiments. pp. 229–247. Springer (2018)

## A Restrictions for Sub-Statements

In this section we define and prove properties of our semantics that will become useful to define syntactic restrictions to the source-level language.

**Definition 12 (Sub-statements).** *We say a statement  $S$  is a direct sub-statement of  $S'$ , written  $S \prec S'$ , if:*

- $S' = \{S_1..S_n\}$  such that  $S \in \{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$
- $S' = \text{if } MS$
- $S' = \text{switch } M \text{ case } v_1 S_1.. \text{case } v_n S_n \text{ default } S_d$  such that  $S = S_d$  or  $S \in \{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$
- $S' = \text{for } S_i M S_p S_b$  such that  $S \in \{S_i, S_p, S_b\}$
- $S' = \text{function } x(\vec{y}) \rightarrow \vec{z}S$

We also say a statement  $S$  is a transitive sub-statement of  $S'$ , written  $S \preceq S'$  if:

- $S' = S$
- $S' = \{S_1..S_n\}$  such that  $\exists i \in [1, n]. S \preceq S_i$
- $S' = \text{if } MS_b$  if  $S \preceq S_b$
- $S' = \text{switch } M \text{ case } v_1 S_1.. \text{case } v_n S_n \text{ default } S_d$  such that  $\exists i \in [1, n]. S \preceq S_i$
- $S' = \text{for } S_i M S_p S_b$  such that  $\exists S'' \in \{S_i, S_p, S_b\}. S \preceq S''$
- $S' = \text{function } x(\vec{y}) \rightarrow \vec{z}S_b$  and  $S \preceq S_b$

When generally referring to sub-statements without specifying which kind, we always mean transitively.

**Definition 13 (Syntactic restrictions for halting statements).** *We impose the following syntactic restrictions on halting statements:*

- **Loop halting:** Let  $S \in \{\text{break}, \text{continue}\}$ . For all  $S \preceq S'$ , there exists an  $S_f = \text{for}\{S_i\}MS_pS_b$  such that  $S_f \preceq S'$  and  $S \preceq S_b$ , but there cannot be a statement  $S'_f = \text{function } x(\vec{y}) \rightarrow \vec{z}S'_b$  such that  $S'_f \preceq S_f$  and  $S \preceq S'_b$ .
- **Function halting:** For all leave  $\preceq S'$ , there exists an  $S_f = \text{function } x(\vec{y}) \rightarrow \vec{z}S_b$  such that  $S_f \preceq S'$  and  $S \preceq S_b$ .

**Lemma 14 (Commutativity of sequencing).** *Given two non-empty sequences of statements  $\vec{S}$  and  $\vec{S}'$ , then (1)  $\iff$  (2) where:*

$$(1) \langle \vec{S}, \vec{S}' \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N}'' \rangle$$

$$(2) \exists (G', L', \mathcal{N}'). \langle \vec{S} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$$

$$\wedge \langle \vec{S}' \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N}'' \rangle$$

*Proof.* This proof follows by structural induction on the derivation tree of  $\langle \vec{S} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle$  and by case analysis on the form of  $\vec{S}$ . The base case, where  $\vec{S} = S_1$ , follows by direct application of SEQREG. The inductive case where  $\vec{S} = S_1, \vec{S}_n$  follows by application of SEQREG and by the inductive hypothesis on the derived configurations containing  $\vec{S}_n$ . By assumption, SEQIRREG does not apply because  $\langle \vec{S} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle$  terminates regularly, while SEQEMPTY holds syntactically.

**Lemma 15 (Containment of Loop Halting Statements).** *Given a configuration  $\langle \text{for } S_i M S_p S_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle$  and  $\mathbb{M} \in \{\text{break}, \text{continue}\}$ , then:*

$$\langle \text{for } S_i M S_p S_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle$$

*Proof.* This follows by induction on the derivation tree of  $\langle \text{for}_{S_i} M S_p S_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle$  and by inspection on the inference rules for loops. Base cases:

- FORFALSE always evaluates to **regular**;
- FORHALT1 catches all **break** in  $S_b$  and produces **regular** as the top-level result;
- FORHALT2 only handles **leave** and thus cannot evaluate to **break** or **continue**.

Inductive cases:

- FORLOOP follows by direct application of the inductive hypothesis – **continue** is not propagated because the result of evaluating  $S_b$  is thrown away;
- FORINIT derives a statement prefixed with  $S_i$ , which by Definition 13 does not contain any statements that evaluate to **break** or **continue**, so by Lemma 14 we directly apply the inductive hypothesis.  $\square$

**Lemma 16 (Lower bound of  $L$ ).** *Given a configuration  $\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle$  for some  $S$  in source-level syntax, if:*

$$\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$$

then  $\text{dom}(L') \supseteq \text{dom}(L)$ .

*Proof.* This follows by structural induction and inspection on the form of  $S$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 17 (Invariance of  $\text{dom}(L)$  in loops).** *Given a configuration  $\langle \text{for}_{S_i} M S_p S_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle$ , if:*

$$\langle \text{for}_{S_i} M S_p S_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$$

then  $\text{dom}(L) = \text{dom}(L')$ .

*Proof.* This follows by structural induction and inspection on the reduction rules. Consider loop initialisation:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{for}\{S_1 \dots S_n\} M S_p S_b \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle &\rightarrow \langle \{S_1 \dots S_n \text{ for}\{ \} M S_p S_b \} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ &\rightarrow \langle \{S_1 \dots S_n \text{ for}\{ \} M S_p S_b \}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

By case analysis on the rules for blocks:

- if  $\langle S_1 \dots S_n \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \text{regular} \mid L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$ , then
 
$$\begin{aligned} \rightarrow^* \langle \{\text{regular for}\{ \} M S_p S_b \}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle &\rightarrow \langle \{\text{for}\{ \} M S_p S_b \}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \\ &\rightarrow^* \langle \{\mathbb{M}\}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid L''; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \\ &\rightarrow^* \langle \mathbb{M} \mid L'' \upharpoonright L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

We know  $\text{dom}(L) = \text{dom}(L'' \upharpoonright L)$  by Lemma 16.

- if  $\langle S_1 \dots S_n \mid L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \mathbb{M} \mid L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$  where  $\mathbb{M} \neq \text{regular}$ , this case is simpler than the previous case and shown by inspection.

The remaining cases are simpler than the one for initialisation.  $\square$

## B Big-Step and Small-Step Equivalence

**Lemma 18 (Semantic Entailment 1).** *Given statement  $S$  in source syntax, global environment  $G$ , state  $L$ , namespace  $\mathcal{N}$ , then for a configuration  $\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle$ :*

- (1)  $\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle S_{ret} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$
- (2)  $\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle S_{ret} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$

it is the case that (1)  $\implies$  (2).

### B.1 Proof of Semantic Entailment 1

Consider a configuration  $\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle$  such that

$$\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle S_r \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$$

By structural induction on the derivation tree of the big-step evaluation of  $\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle$  and by case analysis on the form of  $S$ , we have base cases:

- **Empty Block:** Let  $S = \{\varepsilon\}$ , then for (1) we have

$$\frac{\frac{\langle \varepsilon \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{seq}} \langle \text{regular} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle}{\langle \{\} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{SEQEMPTY}}{\langle \{\} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{BLOCK}$$

For (2), we have by definition:

$$\langle \{\} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle$$

Therefore (1) = (2).

- **Function Definition:** Let  $S = \text{function } x(\vec{y}) \rightarrow \vec{z}M$ , then for (1) we have

$$\frac{\langle \text{function } x(\vec{y}) \rightarrow \vec{z}M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle}{\langle \text{function } x(\vec{y}) \rightarrow \vec{z}M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FUNDEF}$$

For (2), we have by definition:

$$\langle \text{function } x(\vec{y}) \rightarrow \vec{z}M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle$$

Therefore (1) = (2).

- **Identifier:** Let  $S = x$ , then for (1) we have

$$\frac{v = L(x)}{\langle x \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle v \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{IDENT}$$

For (2), we have by definition:

$$\langle x \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow \langle v \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{where } v = L(x)$$

Therefore (1) = (2).

With base cases done, we now proceed with the inductive cases. Recall from structural induction that the inductive hypothesis (IH) states that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle S' \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \Downarrow \langle S_{ret} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N}'' \rangle \\ \implies & \langle S' \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle S_{ret} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N}'' \rangle \end{aligned}$$

for any  $\langle S' \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \Downarrow \langle S_{ret} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N}'' \rangle$  derivable from  $\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle$ . Also recall Lemma 10 which states congruence (CG).



- **Blocks:** Let  $S = \{S_1..S_n\}$ ,  $\vec{S}_n = S_2, \dots, S_n$  and  $\mathcal{N}' = \mathcal{N} \uplus \text{funs}(\{S_1..S_n\})$ . By case analysis on the evaluation of  $S_1$ , for (1) we have the following cases:

[A] **Regular Evaluation:**

$$\frac{\frac{\langle S_1 \mid G; L; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{seq}} \langle \text{regular} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N}' \rangle}{\langle \vec{S}_n \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{seq}} \langle \mathbb{M}_n \mid G_n; L_n; \mathcal{N}' \rangle} \text{SEQREG}}{\langle S_1, \vec{S}_n \mid G; L; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{seq}} \langle \mathbb{M}_n \mid G_n; L_n; \mathcal{N}' \rangle} \text{BLOCK}}{\langle \{S_1..S_n\} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M}_n \mid G_n; L_n \upharpoonright L; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{BLOCK}$$

[B] **Irregular Evaluation:**

$$\frac{\frac{\langle S_1 \mid G; L; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M}_1 \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \quad \mathbb{M}_1 \neq \text{regular}}{\langle S_1, \vec{S}_n \mid G; L; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{seq}} \langle \mathbb{M}_1 \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N}' \rangle} \text{SEQIRREG}}{\langle \{S_1..S_n\} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M}_1 \mid G_1; L_1 \upharpoonright L; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{BLOCK}$$

Now, for (2) we have the following cases:

(A) Assume [A] is the case. We have the following trace:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \{S_1..S_n\} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle \{S_1, \vec{S}_n\}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \\ & \rightarrow^* \langle \{\text{regular}, \vec{S}_n\}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \quad \text{by CG and IH}\langle S_1 \mid G; L; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \text{ in [A]} \\ & \rightarrow \langle \{\vec{S}_n\}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \\ & \rightarrow^* \langle \{\mathbb{M}_n\}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid G_n; L_n; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \quad \text{by CG and IH}\langle \vec{S}_n \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \text{ in [A]} \\ & \rightarrow \langle \mathbb{M}_n \mid G_n; L_n \upharpoonright L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Therefore [A]  $\implies$  (A).

(B) Assume [B] is the case. We have the following trace:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \{S_1..S_n\} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle \{S_1, \vec{S}_n\}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \\ & \rightarrow^* \langle \{\mathbb{M}_1, \vec{S}_n\}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \quad \text{by CG and IH}\langle S_1 \mid G; L; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \text{ in [B]} \\ & \rightarrow \langle \mathbb{M}_1 \mid G_1; L_1 \upharpoonright L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Therefore [B]  $\implies$  (B).

Since [A]  $\implies$  (A) and [B]  $\implies$  (B), we have (1)  $\implies$  (2).

- **Variable Manipulation:** Let us consider rule TUPLEDECL. Let  $S = \text{let } \vec{x} := M$ . Assuming  $\vec{x} \notin \text{dom}(L)$ , for (1) we have:

$$\frac{\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \langle \vec{v} \rangle \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle}{\langle \text{let } \vec{x} := M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G_1; L_1[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{v}]; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{VARDECL}$$

For (2) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \text{let } \vec{x} := M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow^* \langle \text{let } \vec{x} := \langle \vec{v} \rangle \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{by CG and IH}\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G_1; L_1[\vec{x} \mapsto \vec{v}]; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (1)  $\implies$  (2) for TUPLEDECL. Cases VARDECL, ? and ? are similar to above, but with singleton values  $v$  for VARDECL and ?, and assumption  $\vec{x} \in \text{dom}(L)$  for VARDECL and ?.

- **Conditional Branching:** Let us consider rule  $\text{IFT}$ . Let  $S = \text{if } MS$ . For (1) we have:

$$\frac{\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \text{tt} \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \langle S \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle}{\langle \text{if } MS \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{IFT}_{\text{TRUE}}$$

For (2) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \text{if } MS \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow^* \langle \text{if } \text{tt}S \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{by CG and IH} \langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle S \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow^* \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{by CG and IH} \langle S \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (1)  $\implies$  (2) for  $\text{IFT}$ . Case  $\text{IFF}$  is a simpler version of the above with  $\text{ff}$  instead of  $\text{tt}$ ,  $\text{regular}$  in place of  $\mathbb{M}$ , and no application of  $\text{IH} \langle S \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle$ .

- **Switch Branching:** Cases for  $\text{SwC}$  and  $\text{SwD}$  are similar to the case for  $\text{IFT}$ , but with  $v$  in place of  $\text{tt}$ , and either  $S_i$  or  $S_d$  in place of  $S$  if  $v = c_i$  or  $v \notin \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$  respectively.
- **Loop Initialisation:** Let  $\text{for}\{S_1 \dots S_n\}MS_pS_b$ . For (1) we have:

$$\frac{\langle \{S_1 \dots S_n \text{ for}\{ \}MS_pS_b \} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad n > 0}{\langle \text{for}\{S_1 \dots S_n\}MS_pS_b \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FOR}_{\text{INIT}}$$

For (2) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \{S_1 \dots S_n\}MS_pS_b \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle \{S_1 \dots S_n \text{ for}\{ \}MS_pS_b \} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow^* \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{by IH} \langle \{S_1 \dots S_n \text{ for}\{ \}MS_pS_b \} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (1)  $\implies$  (2).

- **Loop False:** Let  $S = \text{for}\{ \}MS_pS_b$ . For (1) we have:

$$\frac{\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \text{ff} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle}{\langle \text{for}\{ \}MS_pS_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FOR}_{\text{FALSE}}$$

For (2) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \text{for}\{ \}MS_pS_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \text{if } M \{ \llbracket S_b \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} S_p \text{ for}\{ \}MS_pS_b \} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \text{if } \text{ff} \{ \llbracket S_b \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} S_p \text{ for}\{ \}MS_pS_b \} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{by CG and IH} \langle M \mid \dots \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \text{regular} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

- **Loop True:** Let  $S = \text{for}\{ \}MS_pS_b$ . For (1) we have the following cases:  
[A] **Loop-Body Halt:**

$$\frac{(\mathbb{M}_1, \mathbb{M}_2) \in \{(\text{break}, \text{regular}), (\text{leave}, \text{leave})\} \quad \langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \text{tt} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \langle S_b \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M}_1 \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle}{\langle \text{for}\{ \}MS_pS_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M}_2 \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FOR}_{\text{HALT1}}$$

[B] **Post-Iteration Halt:**

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \text{tt} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ \langle S_b \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \mathbb{M} \notin \{\text{leave}, \text{break}\} \\ \langle S_p \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{leave} \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{array}}{\langle \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{leave} \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FORHALT2}$$

[C] **Loop Iteration:**

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \text{tt} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ \langle S_b \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \mathbb{M} \notin \{\text{leave}, \text{break}\} \\ \langle S_p \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ \langle \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M}_1 \mid G_4; L_4; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{array}}{\langle \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M}_1 \mid G_4; L_4; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FORLOOP}$$

For (2) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \text{if } M \{ \llbracket S_b \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} S_p \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b \} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \text{if } \text{tt} \{ \llbracket S_b \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} S_p \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b \} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_1; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{by CG and IH} \langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \{ \llbracket S_b \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} S_p \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b \} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_1; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

From here we have the following cases:

(A) Assume [A] is the case, such that  $(\mathbb{M}_1, \mathbb{M}_2) \in \{(\text{break}, \text{regular}), (\text{leave}, \text{leave})\}$ .

We continue the trace as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \{ \llbracket \mathbb{M}_1 \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} S_p \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b \} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{by CG, IH} \langle S_b \dots \rangle \text{ for [A]} \\ & \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \{ \mathbb{M}_1 S_p \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b \} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \mathbb{M}_1 \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle \mathbb{M}_2 \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Therefore [A]  $\implies$  (A).

(B) Assume [B] is the case, such that  $\mathbb{M} \in \{\text{regular}, \text{continue}\}$ . We continue the trace as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \{ \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} S_p \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b \} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{by CG, IH} \langle S_b \dots \rangle \text{ for [B]} \\ & \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \{ \text{regular } S_p \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b \} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \{ S_p \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b \} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \{ \text{leave for}\{\}MS_pS_b \} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{by CG, IH} \langle S_p \dots \rangle \text{ for [B]} \\ & \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \text{leave} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle \text{leave} \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Therefore [B]  $\implies$  (B).

(C) Assume [C] is the case, such that  $\mathbb{M} \in \{\text{regular}, \text{continue}\}$  and  $\mathbb{M} \in \{\text{regular}, \text{leave}\}$ . We continue the trace as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \{\mathbb{M}\}_{\text{cnt}} S_p \text{for}\{ \} M S_p S_b \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{by CG, IH}\langle S_b \dots \rangle \text{ for [C]} \\
& \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \{\text{regular} S_p \text{for}\{ \} M S_p S_b \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \{S_p \text{for}\{ \} M S_p S_b \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \{\text{regular for}\{ \} M S_p S_b \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{by CG, IH}\langle S_p \dots \rangle \text{ for [C]} \\
& \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \{\text{for}\{ \} M S_p S_b \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \{\mathbb{M}_1\} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{by CG, IH}\langle \text{for}\{ \} M S_p S_b \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \text{ for [C]} \\
& \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \mathbb{M}_1 \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \rightarrow \langle \mathbb{M}_1 \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{since } \mathbb{M}_1 \neq \text{break} \text{ by Lem. 15 direction of on } \langle \text{for}\{ \} M S_p S_b \dots \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore [C]  $\implies$  (C).

Since [A,B,C]  $\implies$  (A,B,C), we have (1)  $\implies$  (2).

– **Function Call:** Let  $S = x(M_1, \dots, M_n)$ . For (1) we have:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\langle M_n \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle v_n \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
\vdots \\
\langle M_1 \mid G_{n-1}; L_{n-1}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle v_1 \mid G_n; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
\mathcal{N}(x) = (\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}, \{z_1, \dots, z_m\}, S_b) \\
L' = \{\{y_1, \dots, y_n\} \mapsto \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}\} \uplus \{\{z_1, \dots, z_m\} \mapsto 0\} \\
\langle S_b \mid G_n; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
S_{\text{ret}} = \begin{cases} L''(z_1) & \text{if } m = 1 \\ \langle L''(z_1), \dots, L''(z_m) \rangle & \text{if } m > 1 \\ \text{regular} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
\hline
\langle x(M_1, \dots, M_n) \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle S_{\text{ret}} \mid G''; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{FUNCCALL}
\end{array}$$

For (2) we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle x(M_1, \dots, M_n) \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \rightarrow^* \langle x(M_1, \dots, M_{n-1}, v_n) \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{by CG and IH}\langle M_n \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \rightarrow^* \langle x(M_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, v_n) \mid G_2; L_2; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{by CG and IH}\langle M_{n-1} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \dots \\
& \rightarrow^* \langle x(v_1, \dots, v_n) \mid G_n; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{by CG and IH}\langle M_1 \mid G_{n-1}; L_{n-1}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \rightarrow \langle \langle S_b \rangle_{\bar{L}} \mid G_n; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{where } \mathcal{N}(x) = (\bar{y}, \bar{z}, S_b) \\
& \rightarrow^* \langle \langle \mathbb{M} \rangle_{\bar{L}_n} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \text{by CG and IH}\langle S_b \mid G_n; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \rightarrow \langle S_{\text{ret}} \mid G''; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \begin{cases} S_{\text{ret}} = L''(z_1) & m = 1 \\ S_{\text{ret}} = \langle L''(z_1), \dots, L''(z_m) \rangle & m > 1 \\ S_{\text{ret}} = \text{regular} & m = 0 \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore (1)  $\implies$  (2).

– **Opcode Call:** OPCCALL is a simpler case to FUNCCALL above.  $\square$

**Lemma 19 (Semantic Entailment 2).** *Given statement  $S$  in source syntax, global environment  $G$ , state  $L$ , namespace  $\mathcal{N}$ , then for a configuration  $\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle$ :*

- (1)  $\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle S_{ret} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$   
 (2)  $\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle S_{ret} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$

it is the case that (1)  $\implies$  (2).

## B.2 Proof of Semantic Entailment 2

Consider a configuration  $\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle$  such that

$$\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle S_r \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$$

Recall Lemma 10 for congruence (CG). By induction on the length of the reduction sequence and case analysis on the shape of the term, we have the following cases:

– **Loops:** Let  $S = \text{for}_{S_i} M S_p S_b$ . For (1) we have the following cases:

[A] **Empty initialisation block:** Let  $S_i = \{\}$ . We have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \text{for}\{\} M S_p S_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \text{if } M \{ \llbracket S_b \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} S_p \text{for}\{\} M S_p S_b \} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

By case analysis on the evaluation of  $M$ :

[I] **False:** Assume  $\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \text{ff} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned} & \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \text{if } \text{ff} \{ \llbracket S_b \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} S_p \text{for}\{\} M S_p S_b \} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle && \text{by CG} \\ & \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \text{regular} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

[II] **True:** Assume  $\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \text{tt} \mid G'; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle$  (since expressions cannot modify the top-level  $L$ ) and let  $\mathcal{N}' = \text{funs}(\text{for}\{\} M S_p S_b)$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned} & \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \text{if } \text{tt} \{ \llbracket S_b \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} S_p \text{for}\{\} M S_p S_b \} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G'; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle && \text{by CG} \\ & \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \{ \llbracket S_b \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} S_p \text{for}\{\} M S_p S_b \} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G'; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \{ \llbracket S_b \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} S_p \text{for}\{\} M S_p S_b \} \rrbracket_L^{\mathcal{N}'} \mid G'; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle && \text{since } \mathcal{N}' = \emptyset \end{aligned}$$

By case analysis on the evaluation of  $S_b$ :

[a] **Continue:** Assume  $\langle S_b \mid G'; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \text{continue} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \{ \llbracket \text{continue} \rrbracket_{\text{cnt}} S_p \text{for}\{\} M S_p S_b \} \rrbracket_L^{\mathcal{N}'} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle && \text{by CG} \\ & \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \{ \text{regular } S_p \text{for}\{\} M S_p S_b \} \rrbracket_L^{\mathcal{N}'} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \{ S_p \text{for}\{\} M S_p S_b \} \rrbracket_L^{\mathcal{N}'} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

By cases on evaluation of  $S_p$ , given Definition 13 and Lem. 15 with Lem. 18 (i.e. can only evaluate to leave and regular):

[i] **Leave:** Assume  $\langle S_p \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \text{leave} \mid G'''; L'''; \mathcal{N} \rangle$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \{ \text{leave } \text{for}\{\} M S_p S_b \} \rrbracket_L^{\mathcal{N}'} \mid G'''; L'''; \mathcal{N} \rangle && \text{by CG} \\ & \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \text{leave} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G'''; L'''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow \langle \text{leave} \mid G'''; L'''; \mathcal{N} \rangle && \text{by Lem.17} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{[ii] Regular:} & \text{ Assume } \langle S_p \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \text{regular} \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \text{and } \langle \text{for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_4; L_4; \mathcal{N} \rangle: \\
& \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \{\text{regular for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \{\text{for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \{\mathbb{M}\}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G_4; L_4; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \rightarrow^* \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_4; L_4; \mathcal{N} \rangle \qquad \text{by Lem.17 \& 16}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{M} \in \{\text{regular, leave}\}$  by Def.13, Lem. 15 with Lem. 18.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{[b] Regular:} & \text{ Assume } \langle S_b \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \text{regular} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle: \\
& \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \{\llbracket \{\text{regular}\}_{\text{cnt}} S_p \text{for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \{\text{regular } S_p \text{for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

Then proceeds similar to case [A][II][a].

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{[c] Regular:} & \text{ Assume } \langle S_b \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \text{break} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle: \\
& \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \{\llbracket \{\text{break}\}_{\text{cnt}} S_p \text{for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \rightarrow \langle \llbracket \{\text{break for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \{\text{break}\}_{\text{brk}} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \rightarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

[B] **Non-empty initialisation block:** Let  $S_i = \{S_1..S_n\}$  and let  $\mathcal{N} = \text{funs}(S_1..S_n \text{for}\{ \} MS_p S_b)$ . We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \text{for}\{S_1..S_n\} MS_p S_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \rightarrow \langle \{S_1..S_n \text{for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\
& \rightarrow \langle \{S_1..S_n \text{for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \qquad \text{since } \mathcal{N}' = \emptyset
\end{aligned}$$

From here, by case analysis on the evaluation of  $\{S_1..S_n\}$ :

[I] **Leave:** Assume  $\langle S_i \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \text{leave} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \rightarrow^* \langle \{\text{leave for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle \qquad \text{by CG} \\
& \rightarrow \langle \text{leave} \mid G'; L' \setminus L; \mathcal{N} \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

[II] **Regular:** Assume  $\langle S_i \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \text{regular} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \rightarrow^* \langle \{\text{regular for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle \qquad \text{by CG} \\
& \rightarrow \langle \{\text{for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \}_L^{\mathcal{N}} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

which by Lemma 17 proceeds similar to case [A] above.

For (2) we have the following cases:

(A)(I) **Assume [A][I].** We have:

$$\frac{\frac{\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \text{ff} \mid G'; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \text{ by IH on [A][I]}}{\langle \text{for}\{ \} MS_p S_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G'; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FORFALSE}$$

Therefore [A][I]  $\implies$  (A)(I).

(A)(II) **Assume [A][II]**. By IH on [A][II], we know:

$$\langle M \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \text{tt} \mid G'; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad (\text{A})(\text{II})$$

Then we have the following cases:

(a) **Assume [a]**. By IH on [A][II][a], we know:

$$\langle S_b \mid G'; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{continue} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad (\text{A})(\text{II})(\text{a})$$

(i) **Assume [a][i]**. By IH on [A][II][a][i], we know:

$$\langle S_p \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{leave} \mid G'''; L'''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad (\text{A})(\text{II})(\text{a})(\text{i})$$

We have:

$$\frac{(\text{A})(\text{II}) \quad (\text{A})(\text{II})(\text{a}) \quad (\text{A})(\text{II})(\text{a})(\text{i})}{\langle \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{leave} \mid G'''; L'''; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FORHALT2}$$

Therefore [A][II][a][i]  $\implies$  (A)(II)(a)(i).

(ii) **Assume [a][ii]**. By IH on [A][II][a][ii], we know:

$$\langle S_p \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad (\text{A})(\text{II})(\text{a})(\text{ii})1$$

$$\langle \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b \mid G_3; L_3; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_4; L_4; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad (\text{A})(\text{II})(\text{a})(\text{ii})2$$

We have:

$$\frac{(\text{A})(\text{II}) \quad (\text{A})(\text{II})(\text{a}) \quad (\text{A})(\text{II})(\text{a})(\text{ii})1 \quad (\text{A})(\text{II})(\text{a})(\text{ii})2}{\langle \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_4; L_4; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FORLOOP}$$

Therefore [A][II][a][ii]  $\implies$  (A)(II)(a)(ii).

(b) **Assume [b]**. Proven like cases for (A)(II)(a) above.

(c) **Assume [c]**. By IH on [A][II], we know:

$$\langle S_b \mid G'; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{break} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad (\text{A})(\text{II})(\text{c})$$

We have:

$$\frac{(\text{A})(\text{II}) \quad (\text{A})(\text{II})(\text{c})}{\langle \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{regular} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FORHALT1}$$

Therefore [A][II][c]  $\implies$  (A)(II)(c).

(B)(I) **Assume [B][I]**. We have:

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\langle S_1, \dots, S_n \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{leave} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle}{\langle S_1, \dots, S_n, \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{leave} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{BLOCK}}{\langle \{S_1 \dots S_n \text{for}\{\}MS_pS_b\} \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{leave} \mid G'; L' \upharpoonright L; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FORINIT}}{\langle \text{for}\{S_1 \dots S_n\}MS_pS_b \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \text{leave} \mid G'; L' \upharpoonright L; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FORINIT}$$

Therefore [B][I]  $\implies$  (B)(I).

(B)(II) **Assume [B][II]**. Proven like cases for (A) above.

All cases [A],[B]  $\implies$  (A),(B), therefore (1)  $\implies$  (2).



- **Blocks and branching:** Proven by the same mechanisms already seen in the case for loops above. Loops involve both blocks and conditional statements and thus the proof of the former covers a substantial portion of the latter's. The correspondence is also more clear by inspection.
- **Variables:** The correspondence from small-step to big-step semantics is clear by inspection of the rules. The proof proceeds by simple application of IH on the configuration containing  $M$  for a given assignment  $x := M$ .
- **Expressions:** Since the case for dereferencing identifiers is obvious by inspection, and the case for opcode calls is a simplification of the case for function calls, let us focus on function calls. For a term  $S = x(M_1, \dots, M_n)$ , assuming

$$\langle M_i \mid G_{n-i}; L_{n-i}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle v_i \mid G_{n-i+1}; L_{n-i+1}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad [\text{A}]$$

for each  $i \in [1, n]$ , for (1) we have the trace:

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle x(M_1, \dots, M_n) \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow^* \langle x(M_1, \dots, v_n) \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow^* \langle x(v_1, \dots, v_n) \mid G_n; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket S_b \rrbracket_{L_n}^{\vec{z}} \mid G_n; \{\vec{y} \mapsto \vec{v}\} \uplus \{\vec{z} \mapsto 0\}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \mathcal{N}(x) = (\vec{y}, \vec{z}, S_b) \end{aligned}$$

assuming

$$\langle S_b \mid G_n; \{\vec{y} \mapsto \vec{v}\} \uplus \{\vec{z} \mapsto 0\}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad [\text{B}]$$

we continue trace as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \rightarrow^* \langle \llbracket \mathbb{M} \rrbracket_{L_n}^{\vec{z}} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ & \rightarrow^* \langle \langle L''(z_1), \dots, L''(z_m) \rangle \mid G''; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad \vec{z} = z_1, \dots, z_m, m > 1 \end{aligned}$$

For (2), we first have by IH on [A]:

$$\langle M_i \mid G_{n-i}; L_{n-i}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle v_i \mid G_{n-i+1}; L_{n-i+1}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad (\text{A})$$

Following, by IH on [B]:

$$\langle S_b \mid G_n; \{\vec{y} \mapsto \vec{v}\} \uplus \{\vec{z} \mapsto 0\}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \quad (\text{B})$$

We therefore have the following:

$$\frac{\begin{array}{c} \langle M_n \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle v_n \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ \vdots \\ \langle M_1 \mid G_{n-1}; L_{n-1}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle v_1 \mid G_n; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle \\ \langle S_b \mid G_n; \{\vec{y} \mapsto \vec{v}\} \uplus \{\vec{z} \mapsto 0\}; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G''; L''; \mathcal{N} \rangle \end{array}}{\langle x(M_1, \dots, M_n) \mid G_0; L_0; \mathcal{N} \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{exp}} \langle \langle L''(z_1), \dots, L''(z_m) \rangle \mid G''; L_n; \mathcal{N} \rangle} \text{FUNCALL}$$

Therefore, the case for  $n, m > 1$  holds. Cases for  $n = 1$ ,  $m = 1$  and  $m = 0$  are simplifications of the above. Note for opcode calls that cases for  $\mathcal{M}$  are not necessary to inspect because we are only considering correctly terminating reductions.

With all cases done, we have shown (1)  $\implies$  (2).  $\square$

## C Redundant Contexts

In this section we define and prove properties of our small-step semantics that will become useful to remove redundant evaluation contexts.

**Lemma 20 (Redundant frames).** *Given a statement  $S$ , local stores  $L_1..L_n$ ,  $E \in \{\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{\text{brk}}, \{ \cdot \}_{L_i}^{\mathcal{N}''}\}$  for  $i > 1$ , and  $\text{dom}(L_1) \subseteq \text{dom}(L_2) \subseteq \dots \subseteq \text{dom}(L_n)$  then*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle E_1[\{S\}_{L_1}^{\mathcal{N}''}] \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle &\rightarrow^* \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \\ \iff \langle E_m[..E_1[\{S\}_{L_1}^{\mathcal{N}''}]..] \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle &\rightarrow^* \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where  $E_m[..E_1[\cdot]..]$  is a context composed only of  $E$ 's nested in descending order such that either (1)  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{\text{brk}} \notin \{E_1, \dots, E_m\}$  or (2)  $E_1 = \llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{\text{brk}}$ .

*Proof.* This follows by inspection and structural induction on the reductions. For case (1), it is clear that  $L'' \upharpoonright L_1 = ((L'' \upharpoonright L_1) \upharpoonright L_2) \dots \upharpoonright L_n$ , with everything else in the configurations being the same in the reduction sequence (for one nesting and then for arbitrarily many). For case (2), if  $\langle S \mid G; L; \mathcal{N} \rangle \rightarrow^* \langle \text{break} \mid G'; L'; \mathcal{N}' \rangle$ , then this is caught by  $E_1$  and converted into **regular**. Afterwards,  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{\text{brk}}$  become nullable (as they do not have any effect), which reduces case (2) to case (1), which also applies in every other case.  $\square$

**Corollary 21 (Block dropping).** *From Lemma 20 we can drop sequences of block contexts that appear nested in descending order (i.e. innermost  $L$  subsumes all outer ones).*

**Corollary 22 (Break dropping).** *From Lemma 20 we can see that any interleaving of  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{\text{brk}}$  and  $\{ \cdot \}_L^{\mathcal{N}}$  will not affect the result so long as one  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{\text{brk}}$  is present. This means we can drop break contexts that occur nested with block contexts.*

## D Yul Objects

To use Yul with the solidity compiler, one must use the Yul object notation. Since this notation is external to Yul statements and an official semantics has not been provided, we shall leave out discussing their semantics formally. Instead, this section is an overview. The grammar for objects is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Object: } O &::= \text{object } c_{\text{str}} \{ \text{code } \{S^*\} D^* \} \\ \text{Data: } D &::= O \mid \text{data } c_{\text{str}} c \end{aligned}$$

That is, an object is in essence defined by a triple  $(c_{\text{str}}, S, D^*)$  where  $c_{\text{str}}$  is a string literal that *names* the object, a *code fragment*  $S$ , and a list of *data fragments* that allows for nesting of objects. In addition to the object notation, the EVM dialect for the Solidity compiler extends the set of opcodes with data functions that enable access to named object data elements nested in  $D^*$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DataFun: } \delta &::= \text{datacopy} \mid \text{dataoffset} \mid \text{datasize} \\ \text{Exp: } M &::= \dots \mid \text{datasize}(c_{\text{str}}) \mid \text{dataoffset}(c_{\text{str}}) \mid \text{datacopy}(M, M, M) \end{aligned}$$

Data functions  $\delta$  are variants of opcodes **sizeof**, **offset**, and **codecopy**, and behave analogously — **datasize** and **dataoffset** must be provided a string that identifies an element in the object, and **datacopy** behaves just like **codecopy** in the EVM dialect. Addressing object data is done with a dot notation similar to that of object-oriented programming languages such as Java. Lastly, the EVM dialect with objects introduces a function

`memoryguard`, which assists the compiler and the optimiser by indicating that memory access is restricted to the range defined by interval  $[0, \text{size})$  for `memoryguard(size)`. To illustrate the use of  $\delta$  functions, the following is a typical pattern in Yul objects produced by compiling Solidity smart contracts.

```

/// @use-src 0:"HelloWorld.sol"
object "HelloWorld_20" {
  code {
    ...
    let _1 := allocate_unbounded()
    codecopy(_1, dataoffset("HelloWorld_20_deployed"),
             'datasize("HelloWorld_20_deployed"))
    ...
  }
  /// @use-src 0:"HelloWorld.sol"
  object "HelloWorld_20_deployed" {
    code { ... }
    data ".metadata" hex"a26469706..."
  }
}

```

Comments contain line annotations added by the compiler. The top-level object, named "HelloWorld\_20", contains a sub-object, named "HelloWorld\_20\_deployed", which the top-level code fragment copies into a newly allocated portion of memory specified in `_1` after calling a Yul function `allocate_unbounded()`. Besides code, "HelloWorld\_20\_deployed" contains a special data fragment ".metadata" containing a hex literal which cannot be accessed from the code fragment. Names for special data fragments always start with a dot [38].

Although a semantics is not officially provided, one can estimate a semantics for objects that incorporates our semantics for statements based on the behaviour of the Solidity compiler. Consider the following big-step rule.

$$\frac{\langle S \mid G; \emptyset; \emptyset \rangle \Downarrow_{\Delta} \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_1; L_1; \mathcal{N}_1 \rangle}{\langle \text{object } c_{\text{str}}\{\text{code } S \ D^*\} \mid G \rangle \Downarrow_{\text{Object}} \langle \mathbb{M} \mid G_1 \rangle} \text{OBJECT}$$

where  $\Delta$  is an environment that encodes the list of data fragments  $D^*$  in some manner parametric to the dialect. Intuitively, this says that the evaluation of an object is that of its code fragment within the context of its data fragment. Within  $S$ , only  $\delta$  functions would require accessing  $\Delta$ . Note that the specific interpretation of  $\Delta$  depends on the dialect. More specifically, depending on how program code is stored,  $\Delta$  may additionally need to map the corresponding address offset for each  $D \in \Delta$  such that `codecopy` can access the named data via `dataoffset` and `datasize`. Lastly, we shall leave the definition of the dot naming notation to the chosen instance of  $\Delta$ .