TaPL Seminar

3.1 - 3.4

Kosuke Kiuchi

March 20th, 2023

3 Untyped Arithmetic

Expressions

3 Untyped Arithmetic

Expressions

3.1 Introduction

Language

```
t ::= true
     false
      if t then t else t
      succ t
     pred t
      iszero t
t : metavariable
```

Program

In the present language, program = term.

```
if false then 0 else 1;

1
  iszero (pred (succ 0));

true
```

Results are boolean constants or numbers, called values.

Notice: succ true, if 0 then 0 else 0, ... are allowed this time.

3 Untyped Arithmetic

Expressions

3.2 Syntax

Ways to define terms

- Inductively
- Rule Inferred
- Concretely

Inductive Definition

Definition (3.2.1 Terms, Inductively)

The set of *terms* is the smallest set \mathcal{T} such that

- 1. $\{\text{true, false, 0}\} \subseteq \mathcal{T};$
- 2. if $t_1 \in \mathcal{T}$, then $\{\text{succ } t_1, \text{ pred } t_1, \text{ iszero } t_1\} \subseteq \mathcal{T};$
- 3. if $t_1 \in \mathcal{T}$, $t_2 \in \mathcal{T}$, and $t_3 \in \mathcal{T}$, then if t_1 then t_2 else $t_3 \in \mathcal{T}$.

Definition by Inference Rules

Definition (3.2.2 Terms, by Inference Rules)

The set of terms is defined by the following rules:

$$\begin{array}{cccc} \text{true} \in \mathcal{T} & \text{false} \in \mathcal{T} & 0 \in \mathcal{T} \\ \\ \frac{\textbf{t}_1 \in \mathcal{T}}{\text{succ } \textbf{t}_1 \in \mathcal{T}} & \frac{\textbf{t}_1 \in \mathcal{T}}{\text{pred } \textbf{t}_1 \in \mathcal{T}} & \frac{\textbf{t}_1 \in \mathcal{T}}{\text{iszero } \textbf{t}_1 \in \mathcal{T}} \\ \\ \frac{\textbf{t}_1 \in \mathcal{T} & \textbf{t}_2 \in \mathcal{T} & \textbf{t}_3 \in \mathcal{T}}{\text{if } \textbf{t}_1 \text{ then } \textbf{t}_2 \text{ else } \textbf{t}_3 \in \mathcal{T}} \end{array}$$

Each rule is called inference rule.

Concrete Definition

Definition (3.2.3 Terms, Concretely)

For each natural number i, define a set S_i as follows:

$$egin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_0 &= \emptyset \ & \mathcal{S}_{i+1} = & \{ ext{true, false, 0} \} \ & \cup \{ ext{succ } ext{t}_1, ext{ pred } ext{t}_1, ext{ iszero } ext{t}_1 | ext{t}_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i \} \ & \cup \{ ext{if } ext{t}_1 ext{ then } ext{t}_2 ext{ else } ext{t}_3 | ext{t}_1, ext{ t}_2, ext{ t}_3 \in \mathcal{S}_i \} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, let
$$S = \bigcup_i S_i$$
.

Ex. 3.2.4 $[\star\star]$ How many elements does S_3 have?

Ex. 3.2.4 $[\star\star]$ How many elements does S_3 have?

$$\mathcal{S}_0 = \emptyset$$

$$\therefore |\mathcal{S}_0| = 0$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{i+1} = \{ \text{true, false, 0} \}$$

$$\cup \{ \text{succ t}_1, \text{ pred t}_1, \text{ iszero t}_1 | \mathbf{t}_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i \}$$

$$\cup \{ \text{if t}_1 \text{ then t}_2 \text{ else t}_3 | \mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2, \mathbf{t}_3 \in \mathcal{S}_i \}$$

$$\therefore |\mathcal{S}_{i+1}| = 3 + 3 \times |\mathcal{S}_i| + |\mathcal{S}_i|^3$$

Ex. 3.2.4 $[\star\star]$ How many elements does S_3 have?

$$|\mathcal{S}_0| = 0$$
$$|\mathcal{S}_{i+1}| = 3 + 3 \times |\mathcal{S}_i| + |\mathcal{S}_i|^3$$

$$|S_1| = 3 + 3 \times 0 + 0^3 = 3$$

 $|S_2| = 3 + 3 \times 3 + 3^3 = 39$
 $|S_3| = 3 + 3 \times 39 + 39^3 = 59439$

Ex. 3.2.5 $[\bigstar \bigstar]$ Show that $S_i \subseteq S_{i+1}$

Ex. 3.2.5 $[\bigstar \bigstar]$ Show that $S_i \subseteq S_{i+1}$

Prove inductively. Assume that $t \in S_i$.

• If t is either true, false, 0, obvious.

Ex. 3.2.5 [$\bigstar \star$] Show that $S_i \subseteq S_{i+1}$

Prove inductively. Assume that $t \in S_i$.

- If t is either true, false, 0, obvious.
- If t has the form succ t_1 , $t_1 \in S_{i-1}$ holds. From induction hypothesis, $t_1 \in S_i$.

Therefore succ $t_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{i+1}$. The same holds for pred and iszero.

Ex. 3.2.5 [$\bigstar \star$] Show that $S_i \subseteq S_{i+1}$

Prove inductively. Assume that $t \in S_i$.

- If t is either true, false, 0, obvious.
- If t has the form succ t_1 , $t_1 \in S_{i-1}$ holds. From induction hypothesis, $t_1 \in S_i$.

Therefore succ $t_1 \in \mathcal{S}_{i+1}$. The same holds for pred and iszero.

• If t has the form if t_1 then t_2 else t_3 , $t_1, t_2, t_3 \in \mathcal{S}_{i-1}$ holds. From induction hypothesis, $t_1, t_2, t_3 \in \mathcal{S}_i$.

Therefore if t_1 then t_2 else $t_3 \in \mathcal{S}_{i+1}$

Two Views Define the Same Set

Proposition (3.2.6)

$$\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{S}$$

Proof.

Read p.28.

3 Untyped Arithmetic

Expressions

3.3 Induction on Terms

Inductive

If $t \in \mathcal{T}$, then one of three things must be true:

- 1. t is a constant.
- 2. t has the form succ t_1 , pred t_1 , or iszero t_1 for some smaller term t_1 .
- 3. t has the form if t_1 then t_2 else t_3 for some smaller terms t_1 , t_2 and t_3

We can

- give inductive definitions of functions.
- give *inductive proofs* of properties of terms.

Inductive Definitions of Consts(t)

Definition (3.3.1)

```
Consts(true)
                                      = \{ true \}
Consts(false)
                                      = \{ false \}
Consts(0)
                                     = \{0\}
Consts(succ t_1)
                                      = Consts(t_1)
Consts(pred t<sub>1</sub>)
                                      = Consts(t_1)
Consts(iszero t<sub>1</sub>)
                                      = Consts(t_1)
Consts(if t_1 then t_2 else t_3) = Consts(t_1) \cup Consts(t_2) \cup Consts(t_3)
```

Inductive Definition of size(t)

Definition (3.3.2 size(t))

```
size(true)
                                   = 1
size(false)
                                   = 1
size(0)
                                   = 1
size(succ t_1)
                                   = size(t_1) + 1
size(pred t<sub>1</sub>)
                                   = size(t_1) + 1
size(iszero t<sub>1</sub>)
                                   = size(t_1) + 1
size(if t_1 then t_2 else t_3) = size(t_1) + size(t_2) + size(t_3) + 1
```

Inductive Definition of depth(t)

Definition (3.3.2 depth(t))

```
depth(true)
                                    = 1
depth(false)
                                    = 1
depth(0)
                                    = 1
depth(succ t_1)
                                   = depth(t_1) + 1
depth(pred t<sub>1</sub>)
                                   = depth(t_1) + 1
depth(iszero t<sub>1</sub>)
                                   = depth(t_1) + 1
depth(if t_1 then t_2 else t_3) = max(depth(t_1), depth(t_2), depth(t_3)) + 1
```

Inductive Proof of a Simple Fact

Lemma (3.3.3)

 $|Consts(\mathbf{t})| \leq size(\mathbf{t})$

Proof.

Inductive Proof of a Simple Fact

Lemma (3.3.3)

 $|Consts(t)| \le size(t)$

Proof.

By induction on the depth of t.

Case: t is a constant

Immediate: $|Consts(t)| = |\{t\}| = 1 = size(t)$.

Case: $t = succ t_1$, pred t_1 or iszero t_1

By the IH, $|Consts(t_1)| \leq size(t_1)$.

$$\therefore |Consts(\mathtt{t})| = |Consts(\mathtt{t_1})| \leq size(\mathtt{t_1}) < |Consts(\mathtt{t})|$$

Inductive Proof of a Simple Fact

Lemma (3.3.3)

 $|Consts(t)| \le size(t)$

Proof.

```
Case: t = if t_1 then t_2 else t_3
```

By the IH, $|Consts(t_1)| \le size(t_1)$, $|Consts(t_2)| \le size(t_2)$ and $|Consts(t_3)| \le size(t_3)$.

$$\begin{aligned} |Consts(\mathtt{t})| &= |Consts(\mathtt{t_1}) \cup Consts(\mathtt{t_2}) \cup Consts(\mathtt{t_3})| \\ &\leq |Consts(\mathtt{t_1})| + |Consts(\mathtt{t_2})| + |Consts(\mathtt{t_3})| \\ &\leq size(\mathtt{t_1}) + size(\mathtt{t_2}) + size(\mathtt{t_3}) \\ &< size(\mathtt{t}). \end{aligned}$$

Thress Inductions on Terms

Theorem (3.3.4 Principles of Induction on Terms)

Induction on depth:

$$\forall s \in \mathcal{T}, (\forall r \in \mathcal{T} \text{ s.t. } depth(r) < depth(s), P(r) \rightarrow P(s))$$

 $\rightarrow \forall s \in \mathcal{T}, P(s).$

Induction on size:

$$\forall s \in \mathcal{T}, (\forall r \in \mathcal{T} \ s.t. \ size(r) < size(s), P(r) \rightarrow P(s))$$

 $\rightarrow \forall s \in \mathcal{T}, P(s).$

Structural induction (構造的帰納法):

$$\forall s \in \mathcal{T}, (\forall r \in \mathcal{T} \ s.t. \ r \ is \ a \ immediate \ subterm \ of \ s, P(r) \rightarrow P(s))$$

 $\rightarrow \forall s \in \mathcal{T}, P(s).$

Proof: Exercise (★★)

Proof: Exercise $(\star\star)$

Maybe use the concrete definition and induction on natural numbers.....

$$egin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_0 &= \emptyset \ & \mathcal{S}_{i+1} = & \{ ext{true, false, 0} \} \ & \cup \{ ext{succ } ext{t}_1, ext{ pred } ext{t}_1, ext{ iszero } ext{t}_1 | ext{t}_1 \in \mathcal{S}_i \} \ & \cup \{ ext{if } ext{t}_1 ext{ then } ext{t}_2 ext{ else } ext{t}_3 | ext{t}_1, ext{ t}_2, ext{ t}_3 \in \mathcal{S}_i \} \end{aligned}$$

let
$$\mathcal{P}_i = (\forall \mathtt{s} \in \mathcal{S}_i, (\forall \mathtt{r} \in \mathcal{S}_i \ s.t. \ depth(\mathtt{r}) < depth(\mathtt{s}), P(\mathtt{r}) \to P(\mathtt{s}))$$

 $\to \forall \mathtt{s} \in \mathcal{S}_i, P(\mathtt{s})).$
 $\mathcal{P}_0 \land (\forall i \in \mathbb{N}, \mathcal{P}_i \to \mathcal{P}_{i+1}) \to \forall i \in \mathbb{N}, \mathcal{P}_i. \ (induction \ on \ natural \ numbers)$

Power of Structural Induction

Structural induction is often easier than other inductions.

```
Structural Induction.
By induction on t.
Case: t = true
\dots show P(\texttt{true}) \dots
Case: t = succ t_1
... show P(\mathtt{succ}\ \mathtt{t_1}) using P(\mathtt{t_1}) ...
Case: t = if t_1 then t_2 else t_3
... show P(\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3) \text{ using } P(t_1), P(t_2), P(t_3) \dots
```

3 Untyped Arithmetic

Expressions

3.4 Semantic Styles

In the First Place...

Two elements that characterize programming languages:

- Syntax (構文)
- Semantics (意味論)

Three Semantic Styles

- Operational semantics (操作的意味論)
- Denotational semantics (表示的意味論)
- Axiomatic semantics (公理的意味論)

Operational Semantics

Define an abstract machine and specify the behavior.

Example

if true then
$$t_2$$
 else $t_3 \Rightarrow t_2$ if false then t_2 else $t_3 \Rightarrow t_3$
$$\frac{t_1 \to t_1'}{\text{if } t_1 \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3 \Rightarrow \text{if } t_1' \text{ then } t_2 \text{ else } t_3}$$

We usually use this!

Denotational Semantics

The meaning of a term is taken to be some mathematical object.

Example

$$[0] = 0$$

$$[\![\mathtt{succ}\ \mathtt{t}]\!] = [\![t]\!] + 1$$

$$[\![\mathtt{pred}\ \mathtt{t}]\!] = [\![t]\!] - 1$$

Axiomatic Semantics

One concrete example is Hoare logic.

Hoare Triple

$$\{P\} \ C \ \{Q\}$$

where

- \bullet P is a precondition
- C is a program
- ullet Q is a postcondition

If P holds and C executes, then Q holds.

Ex.
$$\{x = 1, y = 1\}$$
 $z := x + y$ $\{x = 1, y = 1, z = 2\}$