Compilation and Program Analysis (#3b): Semantics ENSL Only

Ludovic Henrio

Master 1, ENS de Lyon et Dpt Info, Lyon1

2021-2022





Me: Ludovic Henrio



web:~lhenrio.github.io email:~ludovic.henrio@ens-lyon.fr

Credits

```
JC Filliâtre (ENS Ulm) / JC Fernandez (Grenoble) /
Nielson-Nielson-Hankin (Book)
Note on organisation:
```

1: Course

2: exercises and proofs during the course;

3: exercises and proofs done after the course (if we have the time)

- Generalities on semantics
- Operational semantics for mini-while
- 3 Comparing the different semantics

Semantics

On the abstract syntax we will define a/the semantics. Different

- axiomatic
- denotational

kinds of semantics:

- by translation
- operational semantics (natural, structural)

Axiomatic Semantics (Hoare logic)

(An axiomatic basis for computer programming, 1969)

Characterisation by properties on variables, using triples of the form:

$$\{P\} \ i \ \{Q\}$$

"if P is true before the instruction i, then Q is true afterwards"

Example:

$${x \ge 0} \ x := x + 1 \ {x > 0}$$

Example of generating rule:

$$\{P[x \leftarrow E]\} \ x := E \ \{P(x)\}$$

proving properties of programs.

Denotational Semantics

Associates to an expression e its mathematical meaning [e]that represents its computation.

Example: arithmetic expressions with a unique variable x:

$$e := x \mid n \mid e + e \mid e * e \mid \dots$$

You must choose a domain for the mathematical meaning with adequate operations (trivial example for expressions).

Semantics by translation

(or Strachey denotational semantics)

We can define the semantics of a language by translation into a language whose semantics is already known.

$$\llbracket x = v + v'
rbracket = y = \text{get } v;$$

 $z = \text{get } v';$
 $x = y + z$

Operational Semantics

Computations from the program to its computed value.

Operates directly on the abstract syntax. 2 kinds (examples for expressions):

 "natural" or "big-steps semantics", evaluates the program in one step

$$e \longrightarrow v$$

• "by reduction" or "small-steps semantics", repeat the evaluation until a result is obtained:

$$e \to e_1 \to e_2 \to \cdots \to v$$

In general results do not need to be a value.

Note: different notations (arrows) exist: $\Downarrow / \Rightarrow / ... \vdash ... \rightarrow ...$

▶ language specification and proving properties of languages.

- Generalities on semantics
- Operational semantics for mini-while
- 3 Comparing the different semantics

mini-while

(abstract) grammar:

```
S(Smt) ::= x := e assign |skip| do nothing |S_1;S_2| sequence | if b then S_1 else S_2 test | while b do S done loop
```

Semantics of expressions

We denote $State = Var \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$.

This kind of state is sometimes called "store". States are denoted by σ . Update is denoted by $\sigma[y\mapsto n]$.

Semantics of arithmetic expressions – Val: $\mathcal{A} \to State \to \mathbf{Z}$ (in each state an integer value): On board

$$Val(n,\sigma) = \mathcal{N}(n)$$

 $Val(x,\sigma) =$
 $Val(e+e',\sigma) =$
 $Val(e \times e',\sigma) =$

Semantics of boolean expressions

 $Val: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow State \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ Exercise during course $(b::=tt \mid ff \mid x \mid b \land b \mid ... \mid e < e \mid ...)$

TD2: Exercise 1

Semantics of arithmetic expressions

Show the two following properties:

- Let $e \in \mathcal{A}$ a given arithmetic expression. Let σ, σ' be two states. Show that if $(\forall x \in Vars(e), \sigma(x) = \sigma'(x))$, then $Val(e, \sigma) = Val(e, \sigma')$.
- 2 Let $e, e' \in \mathcal{A}$, show that:

$$Val(e[e'/x], \sigma) = Val(e, \sigma[x \mapsto Val(e', \sigma)$$

Natural semantics (big step) for mini-while 1/2

Natural semantics (big step) for mini-while 2/2

$$\frac{Val(b,\sigma)=tt \qquad (S,\sigma)\longrightarrow \sigma' \qquad (\text{while } b \text{ do } S \text{ done},\sigma')\longrightarrow \sigma''}{(\text{while } b \text{ do } S \text{ done},\sigma)\longrightarrow \sigma''}$$

$$\frac{Val(b,\sigma) = ff}{(\text{while } b \text{ do } S \text{ done, } \sigma) \longrightarrow \sigma}$$

Example

Compute the semantics (leaves are axioms, nodes are rules) of:

- x := 2; while x > 0 do x := x 1 done
- x := 2; while x > 0 do x := x + 1 done

Using the semantics to prove properties

Example: determinism

In mini-while there is a single way to evaluate a program.

Theorem: Determinism

For all S, for all $\sigma, \sigma', \sigma''$:

- If $(S, \sigma) \to \sigma'$ and $(S, \sigma) \to \sigma''$ then $\sigma' = \sigma''$.
- If $(S, \sigma) \to \sigma'$, there is no infinite derivation.

Proof by induction on the structure of the derivation tree.

Structural Op. Semantics (SOS = small step) for mini-while 1/2

$$(x := e, \sigma) \Rightarrow \sigma[x \mapsto Val(e, \sigma)]$$

$$(\mathsf{skip}, \sigma) \Rightarrow \sigma$$

$$\frac{(S_1, \sigma) \Rightarrow \sigma'}{((S_1; S_2), \sigma) \Rightarrow (S_2, \sigma')} \frac{(S_1, \sigma) \Rightarrow (S_1', \sigma')}{((S_1; S_2), \sigma) \Rightarrow (S_1'; S_2, \sigma')}$$

$$\frac{Val(b, \sigma) = tt}{(\mathsf{if}\ b\ \mathsf{then}\ S_1\ \mathsf{else}\ S_2, \sigma) \Rightarrow (S_1, \sigma)}$$

$$\frac{Val(b, \sigma) = ff}{(\mathsf{if}\ b\ \mathsf{then}\ S_1\ \mathsf{else}\ S_2, \sigma) \Rightarrow (S_2, \sigma)}$$

«- 21 / 45 -»

Structural Op. Semantics (SOS = small step) for mini-while 2/2

(while $b \text{ do } S \text{ done}, \sigma) \Rightarrow$

(if b then $(S; \mathtt{while}\ b\ \mathtt{do}\ S\ \mathtt{done})$ else $\mathtt{skip}, \sigma)$

Exercises

Compute the semantics (leaves are axioms, nodes are rules) of:

- x := 2; while x > 0 do x := x 1 done
- x := 2; while x > 0 do x := x + 1 done

How to prove determinism for the SOS semantics? What is the structure of the proof?

- Generalities on semantics
- Operational semantics for mini-while
- 3 Comparing the different semantics

Comparison: divergence

In general a program diverges if it runs forever. In mini-while, a program diverges in state σ iff:

- NAT: no successor to (S, σ) .
- SOS: infinite sequence begining with (S, σ) .

Note: in other languages/semantics there might be other reasons to have no successor (see later in course), and you could have no successor in the SOS without reaching a final state.

Comparison: equivalence of programs

Semantics is also useful for defining program equivalence, in mini-while it is quite simple:

Two mini-while programs S_1 and S_2 are semantically equivalent iff:

- NAT: $\forall \sigma, \sigma', (S_1, \sigma) \longrightarrow \sigma' \text{ iff } (S_2, \sigma) \longrightarrow \sigma'$
- SOS: ∀σ:
 - for all config (blocking or not): $(S_1, \sigma) \Rightarrow^* \sigma'$ iff $(S_2, \sigma) \Rightarrow^* \sigma'$
 - there exists an infinite sequence from (S_1, σ) iff same for (S_2,σ)

Are the two semantics equivalent?

$$\mathcal{S}_{NS}[S]\sigma = \begin{cases} \sigma' & \text{If } (S,\sigma) \longrightarrow \sigma' \\ undef & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{SOS}[S]\sigma = \begin{cases} \sigma' & \text{If } (S,\sigma) \Rightarrow^* \sigma' \\ undef & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Theorem

$$S_{NS} = S_{SOS}$$

Proof: see next slides ...

Equivalence of semantics 1/2

Proposition

If $(S, \sigma) \longrightarrow \sigma'$ then $(S, \sigma) \Rightarrow^* \sigma'$.

Lemma for Proposition

If
$$(S_1, \sigma) \Rightarrow^k \sigma'$$
 then $((S_1; S_2), \sigma) \Rightarrow^k (S_2, \sigma')$

Proof: structural induction on S (derivation tree).

Equivalence of semantics 2/2

Proposition

If
$$(S, \sigma) \Rightarrow^k \sigma'$$
 then $(S, \sigma) \longrightarrow \sigma'$.

Lemma for Proposition

If
$$(S_1; S_2, \sigma) \Rightarrow^k \sigma''$$
 then there exists σ', k_1 such that $(S_1, \sigma) \Rightarrow^{k_1} \sigma'$ and $(S_2, \sigma) \Rightarrow^{k-k_1} \sigma''$

Proof: induction on k.

Expressing parallelism

SOS can express interleaving, NAT cannot:

$$\frac{(S_1, \sigma) \Rightarrow (S_1', \sigma')}{\left((S_1||S_2), \sigma\right) \Rightarrow (S_1'||S_2, \sigma')} \quad \frac{(S_2, \sigma) \Rightarrow (S_2', \sigma')}{\left((S_1||S_2), \sigma\right) \Rightarrow (S_1||S_2', \sigma')}$$

... more later in the course.

Mini-while is not exactly mini-C

variable initialisation!

- variable declarations
 - Main problem is scope of variables (x may not refer to the same variable depending on the point in the program)
 - see course on typing
- Expression evaluation
 restricted to expressions without side-effect, the val
 function has to be encoded as a set of instructions (a more
 precise semantics would define several reduction steps)
- print-int and print-string (operational semantics not much interesting)
- Mini-C will have functions ... defined later in the course

Conclusion

We have seen different kinds of semantics and compared them briefly.

We have shown how to define operational semantics.

- For expression evaluation
- On mini-while

And how to reason on them to derive language properties (or at least properties of the semantics).

Next course on typing will illustrate m ore about properties. possible additional exercise: **repeat**.

Empty slides for exercise