

Midterm 3 (22C:123)

Open Books and Notes

1. (50) (**Algebraic Semantics**) On page 490 of the textbook, the module `SymbolTable` is defined as an instance of `Mapping`. You are asked to add the function *table-union* (*tu* for short), which is used in the attribute grammar of `Wren` (on page 79), into this module.

- (a) Please formally define *tu*, which should have the same behavior as the one given on page 79.

Answer: We add the following into Module `WrenTypeChecker` on pages 490-491:

```
operations
  tu: SymbolTable, SymbolTable --> SymbolTable

variables
  (same as on page 491)

equations
  tu(nullSymTab, symtab) = symtab
  tu(update(name, type, symtab1), symtab) =
    update(name, type, tu(symtab1, symtab))
    when apply(symtab, name) = ErrorType
  tu(update(name, type, symtab1), symtab) = tu(symtab1, symtab)
    when apply(symtab, name) != ErrorType
```

- (b) Please decide whether the following two properties are true; if it is true, give a complete formal proof, otherwise, give a counter-example.

$$\begin{aligned} tu(t1, t2) &= tu(t2, t1) \\ tu(t1, tu(t2, t3)) &= tu(tu(t1, t2), t3) \end{aligned}$$

where *t1*, *t2*, *t3* are variables of `SymbolTable`.

Answer: (1) In general, `tu(t1, t2)` is NOT equal to `tu(t2, t1)`.

Counterexample: Let `t1 = update("x", naturalType, nullSymTab)`,
and `t2 = update("y", naturalType, nullSymTab)`. Then

`tu(t1, t2) = update("x", naturalType, update("y", naturalType, nullSymTab));`

`tu(t2, t1) = update("y", naturalType, update("x", naturalType, nullSymTab)).`

(2) In general, `tu(t1, tu(t2, t3)) = tu(tu(t1, t2), t3)`. We prove this by the structural induction on variable *t1*.

Basic case: `t1 = nullSymTab`.

Left = `tu(nullSymTab, tu(t2, t3)) = tu(t2, t3)`.

Right = `tu(tu(nullSymTab, t2), t3) = tu(t2, t3)`.

Inductive case: `t1 = update(name, type, t4)`.

As the induction hypothesis, we have `tu(t4, tu(t2, t3)) = tu(tu(t4, t2), t3)`, and we assume that `name` does not appear in `t4`.

There are two subcases:

Case 1: name is neither in t2 nor in t3. That is, $\text{apply}(t2, \text{name}) = \text{ErrorType}$ and $\text{apply}(t3, \text{name}) = \text{ErrorType}$.

In this case, we can prove that the following lemma holds:

Lemma 1: $\text{apply}(\text{tu}(t2, t3), \text{name}) = \text{ErrorType}$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Left} &= \text{tu}(\text{update}(\text{name}, \text{type}, t4), \text{tu}(t2, t3)) \\ &= \text{update}(\text{name}, \text{type}, \text{tu}(t4, \text{tu}(t2, t3))) \text{ (by Lemma 1)} \\ \text{Right} &= \text{tu}(\text{tu}(\text{update}(\text{name}, \text{type}, t4), t2), t3) \\ &= \text{tu}(\text{update}(\text{name}, \text{type}, \text{tu}(t4, t2)), t3) \\ &= \text{update}(\text{name}, \text{type}, \text{tu}(\text{tu}(t4, t2), t3)) \\ &= \text{update}(\text{name}, \text{type}, \text{tu}(t4, \text{tu}(t2, t3))) \text{ (by Induction Hypothesis)} \\ &= \text{Left} \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: name is in t2 or in t3. That is, $\text{apply}(t2, \text{name}) \neq \text{ErrorType}$ or $\text{apply}(t3, \text{name}) \neq \text{ErrorType}$.

Lemma 2: $\text{apply}(\text{tu}(t2, t3), \text{name}) \neq \text{ErrorType}$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Left} &= \text{tu}(\text{update}(\text{name}, \text{type}, t4), \text{tu}(t2, t3)) \\ &= \text{tu}(t4, \text{tu}(t2, t3)) \text{ (by Lemma 2)} \end{aligned}$$

There are two more subcases:

Case 2.1: $\text{apply}(t2, \text{name}) \neq \text{ErrorType}$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Right} &= \text{tu}(\text{tu}(\text{update}(\text{name}, \text{type}, t4), t2), t3) \\ &= \text{tu}(\text{tu}(t4, t2), t3) \\ &= \text{tu}(t4, \text{tu}(t2, t3)) \text{ (by Induction Hypothesis)} \\ &= \text{Left} \end{aligned}$$

Case 2.2: $\text{apply}(t2, \text{name}) = \text{ErrorType}$ and $\text{apply}(t3, \text{name}) \neq \text{ErrorType}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Right} &= \text{tu}(\text{tu}(\text{update}(\text{name}, \text{type}, t4), t2), t3) \\ &= \text{tu}(\text{update}(\text{name}, \text{type}, \text{tu}(t4, t2)), t3) \\ &= \text{tu}(\text{tu}(t4, t2), t3) \\ &= \text{tu}(t4, \text{tu}(t2, t3)) \text{ (by Induction Hypothesis)} \\ &= \text{Left} \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

2. (50) (**Axiomatic Semantics**) The following is a BabyWren program segment C which computes the ceiling of the square root of $n > 0$:

```
x := 1; y := 1;
while (y < n) do
  y := y + 2*x + 1;
  x := x + 1;
end while;
```

- (a) Please state and establish the loop invariant formally and clearly.

Sketch of the answer: The loop invariant is

$$P(x, y) : (y = x^2) \wedge (x - 1)^2 < n$$

You need to prove that (i) P is true right before the loop; (ii) P is true right after the loop.

- (b) Plases establish the total correctness of $\{n > 0\} \ C \ \{x = \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil\}$.

Sketch of the answer: For the partial correctness, we need to prove that $P(x, y) \wedge y \geq n$ imply $\{x = \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil\}$. This is true, because, from $P(x, y) \wedge y \geq n$, we have $(y = x^2) \wedge (x - 1)^2 < n \wedge y \geq n$, or simply $x^2 \geq n$ and $(x - 1)^2 < n$, which is equivalent to $\{x = \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil\}$.

For the total correctness, we need to prove that the while loop will terminate. Pick the natural numbers with the well-founded order $>$, it's easy to see that $n - x$ is a natural number after each loop and its value is decreasing after each loop.