October 19, 2018

Syntax of the Imp Language

```
(intexp) e := 0 | 1 | \dots
             | X
             | -e | e+e | e-e | ...
(boolexp) b := true \mid false
             | e=e | e < e | e < e | ...
             |\neg b|b \wedge b|b \vee b|...
                  no quantified terms
(comm) c := x := e
             skip
             | c;c
             | if b then c else c
              ∣ while b do c
```

Semantics of Sequential Composition

We extend
$$f \in S \to T_{\perp}$$
 to $f_{\perp} \in S_{\perp} \to T_{\perp}$
$$f_{\perp} x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ \begin{array}{cc} \bot & \text{if } x = \bot \\ f \, x & \text{otherwise} \end{array} \right.$$

This defines
$$(-)_{\perp} \in (S \to T_{\perp}) \to (S_{\perp} \to T_{\perp})$$

So
$$[c;c']_{comm} \sigma = ([c']_{comm})_{\perp} ([c]_{comm} \sigma).$$

Semantics of Conditionals

Examples:

```
[if x < 0 then x = -x else skip]]<sub>comm</sub> {(x, -3)}
= [x = -x]]<sub>comm</sub> {(x, -3)} since [x < 0]]<sub>boolexp</sub> {(x, -3)} = true
= {(x, -3)}{x \sim [-x]]<sub>intexp</sub> {(x, -3)}}
= {(x, -3)}
```

Semantics of Loops

Idea: define the meaning of while b do c as that of

if
$$b$$
 then $(c; while b do c)$ else skip

That is,

[while
$$b$$
 do c]_comm σ

$$= [if b \text{ then } (c; \text{while } b \text{ do } c) \text{ else skip}]_{comm} \sigma$$

$$= \begin{cases} ([\text{while } b \text{ do } c]]_{comm})_{\perp} ([[c]]_{comm} \sigma) & \text{if } [[b]]_{boolexp} \sigma = \text{true} \\ \sigma & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

However, the semantic function is *not syntax directed*, as **[while** b **do** c]] $_{comm}$ itself shows as a sub-term on the right side of the equation.

Semantics of Loops

Actually we can view [while $b ext{ do } c$] comm as a solution for this equation:

That is, $[\![\mathbf{while}\ b\ \mathbf{do}\ c]\!]_{comm}$ is a fixed-point of

$$F \stackrel{\mathsf{def}}{=} \lambda f \in \Sigma \to \Sigma_{\perp}. \, \lambda \sigma \in \Sigma. \left\{ \begin{array}{l} f_{\perp}(\llbracket c \rrbracket_{comm} \sigma) & \text{if } \llbracket b \rrbracket_{boolexp} \ \sigma = \text{true} \\ \sigma & \text{otherwise} \end{array} \right.$$

However, not every $F \in (\Sigma \to \Sigma_{\perp}) \to (\Sigma \to \Sigma_{\perp})$ has a fixed-point, and some may have more than one.

Example: for any σ' , $\lambda \sigma$. σ' is a solution for

[while true do
$$x := x + 1$$
] $_{comm}$.



Semantics of Loops

[while b do c]] $_{comm}$ is a fixed-point of

$$F \stackrel{\mathsf{def}}{=} \lambda f \in \Sigma \to \Sigma_{\perp}. \, \lambda \sigma \in \Sigma. \left\{ \begin{array}{l} f_{\perp}(\llbracket c \rrbracket_{comm} \, \sigma) & \text{if } \llbracket b \rrbracket_{boolexp} \, \sigma = \mathbf{true} \\ \sigma & \text{otherwise} \end{array} \right.$$

However, not every $F \in (\Sigma \to \Sigma_{\perp}) \to (\Sigma \to \Sigma_{\perp})$ has a fixed-point, and some may have more than one.

We need to lay some structures over the set $\Sigma \to \Sigma_{\perp}$, to ensure that F has at least one fixed-point.



```
A relation \rho is reflexive on S iff \forall x \in S.x \, \rho \, x transitive iff x \, \rho \, y \wedge y \, \rho \, z \Rightarrow x \, \rho \, z antisymmetric iff x \, \rho \, y \wedge y \, \rho \, x \Rightarrow x = y symmetric iff x \, \rho \, y \Rightarrow y \, \rho \, x
```

```
\sqsubseteq is a preorder on S iff \sqsubseteq is reflexive on S and tansitive \sqsubseteq is a partial order on S iff \sqsubseteq is a preorder on S and antisymme S with a partial order \subseteq on S S with a partial order \subseteq on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S iff S is monotone from S to S iff S is monotone from S to S iff S if S iff S iff S iff S iff S if S iff S if S if
```

```
A relation \rho is reflexive on S iff \forall x \in S.x \, \rho \, x transitive iff x \, \rho \, y \wedge y \, \rho \, z \Rightarrow x \, \rho \, z antisymmetric iff x \, \rho \, y \wedge y \, \rho \, x \Rightarrow x = y symmetric iff x \, \rho \, y \Rightarrow y \, \rho \, x
```

```
\sqsubseteq is a preorder on S
\sqsubseteq is a partial order on S
A poset S
A discretely ordered S

S with a partial order \subseteq on S
A discretely ordered S

S with S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S

S with S as a partial order on S
```

```
A relation \rho is reflexive on S iff \forall x \in S.x \rho x transitive iff x \rho y \wedge y \rho z \Rightarrow x \rho z antisymmetric iff x \rho y \wedge y \rho x \Rightarrow x = y symmetric iff x \rho y \Rightarrow y \rho x
```

 \sqsubseteq is a *preorder* on S iff \sqsubseteq is reflexive on S and tansitive \sqsubseteq is a *partial order* on S iff \sqsubseteq is a preorder on S and antisymmetric

A poset S S with a partial order \sqsubseteq on S

A discretely ordered S S with Id_S as a partial order on S

f is monotone from *S* to *T* iff
$$f \in S \to T$$
 and $\forall x, y \in S. x \sqsubseteq y \Rightarrow f x \sqsubseteq' f y$

y is upper bound of X $\forall x \in X. x \sqsubseteq y$ where $y \in S$ and $X \subseteq Y$

◆ロト ◆樹 ト ◆ 恵 ト ◆ 恵 ・ 夕 ○ ○

```
A relation \rho is reflexive on S iff \forall x \in S.x \, \rho \, x transitive iff x \, \rho \, y \wedge y \, \rho \, z \Rightarrow x \, \rho \, z antisymmetric iff x \, \rho \, y \wedge y \, \rho \, x \Rightarrow x = y symmetric iff x \, \rho \, y \Rightarrow y \, \rho \, x
```

```
\sqsubseteq is a preorder on S \sqsubseteq is a partial order on S A poset S
```

A discretely ordered S

iff \sqsubseteq is a preorder on S and antisymmetric S with a partial order \sqsubseteq on S

S with Id_S as a partial order on S

iff \sqsubseteq is reflexive on S and tansitive

$$f$$
 is monotone from S to T iff $f \in S \to T$ and $\forall x, y \in S. x \sqsubseteq y \Rightarrow f x \sqsubseteq' f y$

y is upper bound of X

$$(x \in X . x \sqsubseteq y)$$
 where $y \in S$ and $X \subseteq S$

```
A relation \rho is reflexive on S iff \forall x \in S.x \rho x transitive iff x \rho y \wedge y \rho z \Rightarrow x \rho z antisymmetric iff x \rho y \wedge y \rho x \Rightarrow x = y symmetric iff x \rho y \Rightarrow y \rho x
```

```
\sqsubseteq is a preorder on S iff \sqsubseteq is reflexive on S and tansitive \sqsubseteq is a partial order on S iff \sqsubseteq is a preorder on S and antisymmetric S with a partial order \sqsubseteq on S S with S with S as a partial order on S
```

f is monotone from S to T iff $f \in S \to T$ and $\forall x, y \in S. x \sqsubseteq y \Rightarrow f x \sqsubseteq' f y$

y is upper bound of X

 $(x \in X . x \sqsubseteq y)$ where $y \in S$ and $X \subseteq S$



```
A relation \rho is reflexive on S iff \forall x \in S.x \rho x transitive iff x \rho y \wedge y \rho z \Rightarrow x \rho z antisymmetric iff x \rho y \wedge y \rho x \Rightarrow x = y symmetric iff x \rho y \Rightarrow y \rho x
```

```
\sqsubseteq is a preorder on S iff \sqsubseteq is reflexive on S and tansitive
```

 \sqsubseteq is a partial order on S iff \sqsubseteq is a preorder on S and antisymmetric

A poset S S with a partial order \sqsubseteq on S

A discretely ordered S S with Id_S as a partial order on S

$$f$$
 is monotone from S to T iff $f \in S \to T$ and $\forall x, y \in S. x \sqsubseteq y \Rightarrow f x \sqsubseteq' f y$

y is upper bound of X

$$Y \in X . x \sqsubseteq y$$
 where $y \in S$ and $X \subseteq S$



```
A relation \rho is reflexive on S iff \forall x \in S. x \rho x transitive iff x \rho y \wedge y \rho z \Rightarrow x \rho z antisymmetric iff x \rho y \wedge y \rho x \Rightarrow x = y symmetric iff x \rho y \Rightarrow y \rho x
```

```
\sqsubseteq is a preorder on S iff \sqsubseteq is reflexive on S and tansitive \sqsubseteq is a partial order on S iff \sqsubseteq is a preorder on S and antisymmetric S with a partial order \sqsubseteq on S A discretely ordered S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S S with Id_S as a partial order on S and Id_S is a partial order Id_S in Id_S is a partial order on S and Id_S is a partial order on S and Id_S is a partial order on S in Id_S is
```

Least Upper Bounds

y is a lub of $X \subseteq S$ if y is an upper bound of X, and $\forall z \in S$. z is an upper bound of $X \Rightarrow y \sqsubseteq z$.

If S is a poset and $X \subseteq S$, there is at most one lub of $X (\sqcup X)$.

 $\sqcup \emptyset = \bot$, the least element of S (if exists).

Let $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}(S)$ such that $\sqcup X$ exists for all $X \in X$. Then

$$\sqcup\{\sqcup X\mid X\in\mathcal{X}\}=\sqcup\left(\bigcup\mathcal{X}\right)$$

if either of these lub exists.

Domains

A *chain C* is a countably infinite non-decreasing sequence $x_0 \sqsubseteq x_1 \sqsubseteq \dots$

We may also use *C* to represent the set of elements on the chain.

The *limit* of a chain *C* is the lub of all its elements when it exists.

A chain C is interesting if $(\sqcup C) \notin C$. (Chains with finitely many distinct elements are uninteresting.)

A poset D is a predomain (or complete partial order – cpo) if every chain of elements in D has a limit in D.

A predomain D is a *domain* (or *pointed cpo*) if D has a least element \bot .



Lifting

 D_{\perp} is a *lifting* of the predomain *D* if:

- $\perp \notin D$, and
- $x \sqsubseteq_{D_{\perp}} y$ iff either $x = \bot$ or $x \sqsubseteq_{D} y$

 D_{\perp} is a domain.

Any set S can be viewed as a predomain with *discrete partial* order $\sqsubseteq \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \operatorname{Id}_S$.

D is a *flat domain* if $D - \{\bot\}$ is discretely ordered by \sqsubseteq .



Continuous Functions

If D and D' are predomains, $f \in D \to D'$ is a continuous function from D to D' if it maps limits to limits:

$$f(\sqcup C) = \sqcup' \{f x_i \mid x_i \in C\}$$
 for every chain C in D

Continuous functions are monotone: consider chains $x \sqsubseteq y \sqsubseteq y \dots$

There are non-continuous monotone functions: Suppose $C = x_0 \sqsubseteq x_1 \sqsubseteq x_2 \sqsubseteq \dots$ is an interesting chain in D with a limit x, and $D' = \{\bot, \top\}$ such that $\bot \sqsubseteq' \top$. Then

$$f = \lambda y. \begin{cases} \bot & \text{if } y \in C \\ \top & \text{if } y = x \end{cases}$$

is monotone but not continuous: $\Box'\{f|x_i\mid x_i\in C\}=\bot\neq\top=f(\Box C)$



Continuous Functions

If D and D' are predomains, $f \in D \to D'$ is a continuous function from D to D' if it maps limits to limits:

$$f(\sqcup C) = \sqcup' \{f x_i \mid x_i \in C\}$$
 for every chain C in D

Continuous functions are monotone: consider chains $x \sqsubseteq y \sqsubseteq y \dots$

There are non-continuous monotone functions:

Suppose $C = x_0 \sqsubseteq x_1 \sqsubseteq x_2 \sqsubseteq ...$ is an interesting chain in D with a limit x, and $D' = \{\bot, \top\}$ such that $\bot \sqsubseteq' \top$. Then

$$f = \lambda y.$$
 $\begin{cases} \bot & \text{if } y \in C \\ \top & \text{if } y = x \end{cases}$

is monotone but not continuous: $\sqcup'\{f x_i \mid x_i \in C\} = \bot \neq \top = f(\sqcup C)$



Monotone vs Continuous Functions

A monotone function $f \in D \to D'$ is continuous iff for all *interesting* chains $x_0 \sqsubseteq x_1 \sqsubseteq \ldots$, we have $f(\bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} x_i) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} (f x_i)$.

Proof.

The right-direction implication is obvious following the definition of continuous functions. We prove the left-direction implication.

- for uninteresting chains $x_0 \sqsubseteq x_1 \sqsubseteq \ldots \sqsubseteq x_n$, $x_n = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^n x_i$. Since f is monotone, $f(\bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} x_i) = f x_n = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} (f x_i)$.
- for interesting chains, suppose $x = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} x_i$. We know $f x_i \sqsubseteq f x$ holds for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$, following the monotonicity of f. Therefore $\bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} (f x_i) \sqsubseteq f x = f(\bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} x_i)$. Given assumption $f(\bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} x_i) \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} (f x_i)$, we know $f(\bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} x_i) = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} (f x_i)$.



The (Pre)domain of Continuous Functions

pointwise ordering of functions in $P \rightarrow P'$, where P' is a predomain:

$$f \sqsubseteq_{\rightarrow} g \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \forall x \in P. f x \sqsubseteq_{P'} g x$$

Proposition:

If both P and P' are predomains, then the set $[P \to P']$ of continuous functions in $P \to P'$ with partial order \sqsubseteq_{\to} is a predomain, such that for any chain $f_0 \sqsubseteq_{\to} f_1 \sqsubseteq_{\to} \ldots$, we have

$$\bigsqcup_{i} f_{i} = \lambda x \in P. \bigsqcup_{i}' (f_{i} x).$$

If P' is a domain, then $[P \to P']$ is a domain with $\bot_{\to} = \lambda x \in P$. $\bot_{P'}$.



The (Pre)domain of Continuous Functions: Proof

To prove $[P \rightarrow P']$ is a predomain, we need to prove

- Every chain $f_0 \sqsubseteq_{\rightarrow} f_1 \sqsubseteq_{\rightarrow} \dots$ in $[P \rightarrow P']$ has a limit f; and
- 2 f is also in $[P \rightarrow P']$.

Proof:

Let $f = \lambda x \in P$. $\bigsqcup_i' (f_i x)$. f is well defined, i.e. $\bigsqcup_i' (f_i x)$ exists, because P' is a predomain, and $f_0 x \sqsubseteq_{P'} f_1 x \sqsubseteq_{P'} \dots$ since $f_0 \sqsubseteq_{\to} f_1 \sqsubseteq_{\to} \dots$

Then we prove

- 1.1 It is an upper bound of $f_0 \sqsubseteq_{\rightarrow} f_1 \sqsubseteq_{\rightarrow} \dots$ in $[P \to P']$ has a limit f;
- 1.2 It is the least upper bound;
 - 2 It is continuous, thus it is also in $[P \rightarrow P']$.



The (Pre)domain of Continuous Functions: Proof (cont'd)

Proof of **1.1**: *f* is an upper bound.

 $f_i \sqsubseteq_{\rightarrow} f$ because $\forall x \in P.f_i \ x \sqsubseteq_{P'} (\bigsqcup_i' (f_i \ x)) = f \ x$. Therefore f is an upper bound of $f_0 \sqsubseteq_{\rightarrow} f_1 \sqsubseteq_{\rightarrow} \dots$

Proof of **1.2**: *f* is the least upper bound.

If g is another upper bound, then $\forall x \in P.f_i \ x \sqsubseteq_{P'} g \ x$ holds for all i. Therefore $\forall x \in P.f_i \ x \sqsubseteq_{P'} \mid |_i'(f_i \ x) = f \ x \sqsubseteq_{P'} g \ x$, i.e. $f \sqsubseteq_{\rightarrow} g$.

Proof of **2**: f is continuous, that is, for any chain $x_0 \sqsubseteq x_1 \ldots$ in P, $f(\bigsqcup_j x_j) = \bigsqcup_j' (f x_j)$.

We know

$$f(\bigsqcup_{j} x_{j}) = {}^{1} \bigsqcup_{i}' (f_{i}(\bigsqcup_{j} x_{j})) = {}^{2} \bigsqcup_{i}' (\bigsqcup_{j}' (f_{i} x_{j})) = {}^{3} \bigsqcup_{j}' (\bigsqcup_{i}' (f_{i} x_{j})) = {}^{4} \bigsqcup_{j}' (f x_{j})$$

- 1. Definition of f 2. f_i is continuous
- 3. property of lub 4. Definition of f

Examples: Continuous Functions

For predomains P, P' and P'',

- If $f \in P \to P'$ is a constant function, then $f \in [P \to P']$.
- $\operatorname{Id}_P \in [P \to P]$.
- If $f \in [P \to P']$ and $g \in [P' \to P'']$, then $g \circ f \in [P \to P'']$.
- If $f \in [P \to P']$, then $(- \circ f) \in [[P' \to P''] \to [P \to P'']]$.
- If $f \in [P \to P']$, then $(- \circ f) \in [[P' \to P''] \to [P \to P'']]$.
- If $g \in [P' \to P'']$, then $(g \circ -) \in [[P \to P'] \to [P \to P'']]$.



Strict Functions and Lifting

If *D* and *D'* are domains, $f \in D \to D'$ is *strict* if $f \perp = \perp'$.

If *P* and *P'* are predomains and $f \in P \rightarrow P'$, then the strict function

$$f_{\perp} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda x \in P_{\perp}. \begin{cases} f x & \text{if } x \in P \\ \bot' & \text{if } x = \bot \end{cases}$$

is the *lifting* of f to $P_{\perp} \rightarrow P'_{\perp}$. If P' is a domain, then the strict function

$$f_{\perp \!\!\!\perp} \stackrel{\mathsf{def}}{=} \lambda x \in P_{\perp}. \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} f \, x & \mathsf{if} \, x \in P \\ \bot' & \mathsf{if} \, x = \bot \end{array} \right.$$

is the *source lifting* of f to $P_{\perp} \rightarrow P'$.

If f is continuous, so are f_{\perp} and f_{\parallel} . $(-)_{\perp}$ and $(-)_{\parallel}$ are also continuous.



Least Fixed-Point

If $x \in S \to S$, then $x \in S$ is a fixed-point of f if x = f x.

Theorem [Least Fixed-Point of a Continuous Function, a.k.a. Kleene Fixed-Point Theorem]

If *D* is a domain and $f \in [D \to D]$, then $x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} (f^i \perp)$ is the *least fixed-point* of *f*. (Note $f^0 = \operatorname{Id}_D$ and $f^{n+1} = f \circ (f^n)$)

Proof.

x is well-defined because $\bot \sqsubseteq f \bot \sqsubseteq f^2 \bot \sqsubseteq ...$ is a chain. (why?)

x is a fixed-point because

$$f x = f\left(\bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} (f^{i} \perp)\right) = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} (f(f^{i} \perp)) = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (f^{i} \perp) = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} (f^{i} \perp) = x$$

For any fixed-point y of f, $\bot \sqsubseteq y \Rightarrow f \bot \sqsubseteq f y = y$.

By induction, we have $\forall i \in \mathbf{N}$. $f^i \perp \sqsubseteq y$. So y is an upper bound of the chain $\perp \sqsubseteq f \perp \sqsubseteq \ldots$ Since x is a lub, so $x \sqsubseteq y$.



The Least Fixed-Point Operator

Let

$$\mathbf{Y}_D = \lambda f \in [D \to D]. \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} (f^i \perp)$$

then for each $f \in [D \to D]$, $\mathbf{Y}_D f$ is the least fixed-point of f.

$$\mathbf{Y}_D \in [[D \to D] \to D]$$

Get Back to Semantics of Loops

Recall our first attempt:

It implies that $[\![\mathbf{while}\ b\ \mathbf{do}\ c]\!]_{comm}$ is a fixed-point of

$$F \stackrel{\mathsf{def}}{=} \lambda f \in [\Sigma \to \Sigma_{\perp}]. \lambda \sigma \in \Sigma. \left\{ \begin{array}{l} f_{\perp}(\llbracket c \rrbracket_{comm} \sigma) & \text{if } \llbracket b \rrbracket_{boolexp} \ \sigma = \text{true} \\ \sigma & \text{otherwise} \end{array} \right.$$

We pick the least fixed-point:

$$\llbracket \mathbf{while} \ b \ \mathbf{do} \ c \rrbracket_{comm} \stackrel{\mathsf{def}}{=} \ \mathbf{Y}_{[\Sigma \to \Sigma_{\perp}]} \ F$$



Semantics of Loops: Intuition

$$w_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{ while true do skip} \qquad \llbracket w_0 \rrbracket_{comm} = \lambda \sigma. \perp \\ w_{i+1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{ if } b \text{ then } (c \text{ ; } w_i) \text{ else skip} \qquad \llbracket w_{i+1} \rrbracket_{comm} = F \llbracket w_i \rrbracket_{comm}$$

Suppose the loop **while** b **do** c at state σ evaluates the condition (b) n times before it terminates. Then it behaves like w_i for all $i \ge n$.

$$\llbracket w_i \rrbracket_{comm} \sigma = \begin{cases} \llbracket \mathbf{while} \ b \ \mathbf{do} \ c \rrbracket_{comm} \sigma \ \text{ if } i \geq n \\ \bot \qquad \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

If the loop never terminates:

[while
$$b$$
 do c]] $_{comm} \sigma = \bot = [[w_i]]_{comm} \sigma$ (for all i)

Therefore

$$\forall \sigma \in \Sigma$$
. [while b do c]] $_{comm} \sigma = \bigsqcup_{i=0}^{\infty} ([w_i]]_{comm} \sigma)$

So we have [while b do c]] $_{comm} = \mathbf{Y}_{[\Sigma \to \Sigma_{\perp}]} F_{comm}$

Variable Declarations

Syntax

$$c := \mathbf{newvar} \ x := e \mathbf{in} \ c$$

Semantics:

(**newvar** x := e **in** c) binds x in c, but not in e:

$$fv(\mathbf{newvar}\ x := e\ \mathbf{in}\ c) = (fv(c) - \{x\}) \cup fv(e)$$

Free Variables and Assigned Variables

Free variables:

```
\begin{split} \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(x := e) &= \{x\} \cup \textit{fv}_{\textit{intexp}}(e) \\ \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(\textbf{skip}) &= \emptyset \\ \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(c \, ; c') &= \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(c) \cup \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(c') \\ \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(\textbf{if} \ b \ \textbf{then} \ c_0 \ \textbf{else} \ c_1) &= \textit{fv}_{\textit{boolexp}}(b) \cup \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(c_0) \cup \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(c_1) \\ \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(\textbf{while} \ b \ \textbf{do} \ c) &= \textit{fv}_{\textit{boolexp}}(b) \cup \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(c) \\ \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(\textbf{newvar} \ x := e \ \textbf{in} \ c) &= (\textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(c) - \{x\}) \cup \textit{fv}_{\textit{intexp}}(e) \end{split}
```

Assigned variables:

$$fa(x := e) = \{x\}$$

$$fa(\mathbf{skip}) = \emptyset$$

$$fa(c; c') = fa(c) \cup fa(c')$$

$$fa(\mathbf{if} \ b \ \mathbf{then} \ c_0 \ \mathbf{else} \ c_1) = fa(c_0) \cup fa(c_1)$$

$$fa(\mathbf{while} \ b \ \mathbf{do} \ c) = fa(c)$$

$$fa(\mathbf{newvar} \ x := e \ \mathbf{in} \ c) = fa(c) - \{x\}$$

Free Variables and Assigned Variables

Free variables:

```
\begin{split} \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(x := e) &= \{x\} \cup \textit{fv}_{\textit{intexp}}(e) \\ \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(\textbf{skip}) &= \emptyset \\ \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(c \, ; c') &= \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(c) \cup \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(c') \\ \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(\textbf{if} \ b \ \textbf{then} \ c_0 \ \textbf{else} \ c_1) &= \textit{fv}_{\textit{boolexp}}(b) \cup \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(c_0) \cup \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(c_1) \\ \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(\textbf{while} \ b \ \textbf{do} \ c) &= \textit{fv}_{\textit{boolexp}}(b) \cup \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(c) \\ \textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(\textbf{newvar} \ x := e \ \textbf{in} \ c) &= (\textit{fv}_{\textit{comm}}(c) - \{x\}) \cup \textit{fv}_{\textit{intexp}}(e) \end{split}
```

Assigned variables:

$$fa(x := e) = \{x\}$$

$$fa(\mathbf{skip}) = \emptyset$$

$$fa(c; c') = fa(c) \cup fa(c')$$

$$fa(\mathbf{if} \ b \ \mathbf{then} \ c_0 \ \mathbf{else} \ c_1) = fa(c_0) \cup fa(c_1)$$

$$fa(\mathbf{while} \ b \ \mathbf{do} \ c) = fa(c)$$

$$fa(\mathbf{newvar} \ x := e \ \mathbf{in} \ c) = fa(c) - \{x\}$$

Coincidence Theorem for Commands

The meaning of a command now depends not only on the mapping of its free variables:

 $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma x = \sigma x$ if $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma \neq \bot$ and $x \notin fv(c)$ (i.e. all non-free variables get the values they had before c was executed).

Coincidence Theorem:

- If $\sigma x = \sigma' x$ for all $x \in fv(c)$, then $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma = \bot = [\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma'$, or $\forall x \in fv(c)$. $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma x = [\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma' x$.
- If $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma \neq \bot$, then $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma x = \sigma x$ for all $x \notin fv(c)$.

Renaming Theorem:

If
$$x' \notin fv(c) - \{x\}$$
, then

 $[\![\mathbf{newvar}\ x := e\ \mathbf{in}\ c]\!]_{comm} \sigma = [\![\mathbf{newvar}\ x' := e\ \mathbf{in}\ c[x'/x]]\!]_{comm} \sigma$



Coincidence Theorem for Commands

The meaning of a command now depends not only on the mapping of its free variables:

 $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma x = \sigma x$ if $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma \neq \bot$ and $x \notin fv(c)$ (i.e. all non-free variables get the values they had before c was executed).

Coincidence Theorem:

- If $\sigma x = \sigma' x$ for all $x \in fv(c)$, then $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma = \bot = [\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma'$, or $\forall x \in fv(c)$. $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma x = [\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma' x$.
- If $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma \neq \bot$, then $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma x = \sigma x$ for all $x \notin fv(c)$.

Renaming Theorem:

```
If x' \notin fv(c) - \{x\}, then [[newvar \ x] := e \text{ in } c]_{comm} \sigma = [[newvar \ x'] := e \text{ in } c[x'/x]]_{comm} \sigma
```



Abstractness of Semantics

Abstract semantics are an attempt to separate the important properties of a language (what computations can it express) from the unimportant (how exactly computations are represented).

The more terms are considered equal by a semantics, the more abstract it is.

A semantic function $[-]_1$ is at least as abstract as $[-]_0$ if

$$\forall c, c'. [\![c]\!]_0 = [\![c']\!]_0 \Rightarrow [\![c]\!]_1 = [\![c']\!]_1$$

Soundness of Semantics

If there are other means of observing the result of a computation, a semantics may be incorrect if it equates too many terms.

A *context C* is a command with a *hole* ●.

A command c can be *placed in the hole* of C, yielding C[c] (not substitution — name capture is allowed).

Example:

If
$$C =$$
newvar $x := 1$ **in** • ; $y := x$;, then

$$C[x := x + 1] =$$
newvar $x := 1$ **in** $x := x + 1$ **;** $y := x$;

Let O be an observation, and O be a set of observations, i.e.

 $O \in O \subseteq comm \rightarrow outcomes$.

Also we use *C* for the set of all contexts.

A semantic function [-] is sound (with respect to O) iff

$$\forall c, c'. \llbracket c \rrbracket = \llbracket c' \rrbracket \Rightarrow \forall O \in O. \forall C \in C. O(C[c]) = O(C[c'])$$



Soundness and Full Abstractness

A semantic function [-] is sound (with respect to O) iff

$$\forall c, c'. \llbracket c \rrbracket = \llbracket c' \rrbracket \Rightarrow \forall O \in O. \forall C \in C. O(C[c]) = O(C[c'])$$

A semantic function [-] is fully abstract (with respect to O) iff

$$\forall c, c'. \llbracket c \rrbracket = \llbracket c' \rrbracket \Leftrightarrow \forall O \in O. \forall C \in C. O(C[c]) = O(C[c'])$$

i.e. [-] is the "most abstract" sound semantics.

- \Rightarrow (soundness): [-] cannot be too abstract;
- ←: [[−]] cannot be too concrete either

Proposition:

If $[-]_0$ and $[-]_1$ are both fully abstract semantics with respect to O, then $[-]_0 = [-]_1$, i.e. $\forall c$. $[c]_0 = [c]_1$.



Full Abstractness of Semantics for Imp

Let
$$O_{\sigma,x} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda c$$
.
$$\begin{cases} \bot & \text{if } [\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma = \bot \\ \sigma' x & \text{if } [\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma = \sigma' \end{cases}$$

So $O_{\sigma,\chi}$ is an observation, and $O_{\sigma,\chi} \in comm \to \mathbf{Z}_{\perp}$ Let O be the set of all such observations, i.e.

$$O = \{O_{\sigma,x} \mid \sigma \in \Sigma \text{ and } x \in var\}$$

Proposition: $[-]_{comm}$ is fully abstract with respect to O.

- $[-]_{comm}$ is sound: By compositionality, if $[c]_{comm} = [c']_{comm}$, then for any context C, $[C[c]]_{comm} = [C[c']]_{comm}$ (induction). So $O_{\sigma,x}(C[c]) = O_{\sigma,x}(C[c'])$ for any observation $O_{\sigma,x}$.
- $\llbracket \rrbracket_{comm}$ is most abstract: consider the empty context $C = \bullet$. If $O_{\sigma,x}(c) = O_{\sigma,x}(c')$ holds for all $x \in var$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$, we know $\llbracket c \rrbracket_{comm} = \llbracket c' \rrbracket_{comm}$.



Observing Termination of Closed Commands

Suppose we only care about termination of *closed* programs.

Let
$$O' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda c$$
. $\begin{cases} \text{ false } \text{ if } \exists \sigma. \llbracket c \rrbracket_{comm} \sigma = \bot \\ \text{ true } \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$

Note that if c is closed, whether $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma$ terminates or not is independent with σ .

O' is an observation, with type $comm \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$

Let $O' = \{O'\}$. $[-]]_{comm}$ is fully abstract with respect to O' if we only consider closed environments, i.e.

$$\forall c, c'. \llbracket c \rrbracket_{comm} = \llbracket c' \rrbracket_{comm} \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\forall O \in O'. \forall C \in C. fv(C[c]) \cup fv(C[c']) = \emptyset$$

$$\Rightarrow O(C[c]) = O(C[c'])$$

Observing Termination of Closed Commands (cont'd)

The proof of soundness (\Rightarrow) is the same as before. We prove the semantics is most abstract with respect to O' (\Leftarrow) .

Suppose $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \neq [\![c']\!]_{comm}$, we could construct a context C such that $O'(C[c]) \neq O'(C[c])$.

Suppose $\llbracket c \rrbracket_{comm} \sigma \neq \llbracket c' \rrbracket_{comm} \sigma$ for some σ . Let $\{x_i \mid i \in [1, n]\} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathit{fv}(c) \cup \mathit{fv}(c')$, and k_i be constants such that $k_i = \sigma x_i$.

Then by the Coincidence Theorem, for any σ' and σ'' ,

$$[\![c]\!]_{comm} \left(\sigma'\{x_1 \leadsto k_1, \dots, x_n \leadsto k_n\}\right)$$

$$\neq [\![c']\!]_{comm} \left(\sigma''\{x_1 \leadsto k_1, \dots, x_n \leadsto k_n\}\right)$$

Observing Termination of Closed Commands (cont'd)

Consider then the context C closing both c and c':

$$C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=}$$
 newvar $x_1 = k_1$ in ... newvar $x_n = k_n$ in •

First we show, for any σ' and σ'' , it is impossible to have $[\![C[c]]\!]_{comm} \sigma' = [\![C[c']]\!]_{comm} \sigma'' = \bot$.

This is because

$$[\![C[c]]\!]_{comm} \sigma' = f_{\perp} ([\![c]\!]_{comm} (\sigma'\{x_1 \leadsto k_1, \dots, x_n \leadsto k_n\}))$$
where $f = (-)\{x_1 \leadsto \sigma' x_1, \dots, x_n \leadsto \sigma' x_n\}$

So
$$\llbracket C[c] \rrbracket_{comm} \sigma' = \llbracket C[c'] \rrbracket_{comm} \sigma'' = \bot$$
 only if $\llbracket c \rrbracket_{comm} (\sigma' \{x_1 \leadsto k_1, \dots, x_n \leadsto k_n\}) = \llbracket c' \rrbracket_{comm} (\sigma'' \{x_1 \leadsto k_1, \dots, x_n \leadsto k_n\}).$

This cannot be true, as we show in the previous slide.

Observing Termination of Closed Commands (cont'd)

- Only one of C[c] and C[c'] terminates. Then $O'(C[c]) \neq O'(C[c'])$. We are done.
- Both C[c] and C[c'] terminate. So $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma \neq \bot \neq [\![c']\!]_{comm} \sigma$. Since $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma \neq [\![c']\!]_{comm} \sigma$, there exist x and k such that $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \sigma x = k \neq [\![c']\!]_{comm} \sigma x$.

We construct another context C':

$$C' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C[\bullet; \text{while } x = k \text{ do skip}],$$

so C'[c] diverges, but C'[c'] doesn't. Therefore O'(C'[c]) =false \neq true = O'(C'[c']).



Extension: The fail Command

Syntax: c := fail

To give semantics to **fail**, we need to extend our semantic domains, just like we lift Σ to Σ_{\perp} to give semantics to diverging programs.

We define
$$\hat{\Sigma} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Sigma \cup \{\text{abort}\} \times \Sigma$$
, and $\hat{\Sigma}_{\perp} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\hat{\Sigma})_{\perp}$.

Now $[\![c]\!]_{comm} \in \Sigma \to \hat{\Sigma}_{\perp}$.

Semantics:

where f_* is a lifting of $f \in \Sigma \to \hat{\Sigma}_{\perp}$ to $\hat{\Sigma}_{\perp} \to \hat{\Sigma}_{\perp}$.



Semantics with fail Command

Semantics:

How to define semantics of **newvar** x := e in c?

Local Declarations with Failure: Problem

Recall the semantics of local declarations:

$$[\![\mathbf{newvar} \ x := e \ \mathbf{in} \ c]\!]_{comm} \sigma$$

$$\stackrel{\mathsf{def}}{=} ((-)\{x \leadsto \sigma x\})_{\perp} ([\![c]\!]_{comm} (\sigma \{x \leadsto [\![e]\!]_{intexp} \sigma \}))$$

The naive generalization in the presence of failure:

$$[\![\mathbf{newvar}\ x := e \ \mathbf{in}\ c]\!]_{comm} \sigma$$

$$\stackrel{\mathsf{def}}{=} ((-)\{x \leadsto \sigma x\})_* ([\![c]\!]_{comm} (\sigma\{x \leadsto [\![e]\!]_{intexp} \sigma\}))$$

doesn't quite work: if *c* fails, the result shows the state when *c* failed:

$$[\![\text{newvar } x := 1 \text{ in fail}]\!]_{comm} \sigma = (\text{abort}, \sigma\{x \leadsto 1\})$$

so names of local variables can be exported out of scope.



Local Declarations with Failure

Naive semantics means renaming does not preserve meaning:

```
x := 0; [newvar x := 1 in fail]]_{comm} \sigma = (abort, \sigma \{x \leadsto 1\})
x := 0; [newvar y := 1 in fail]]_{comm} \sigma = (abort, \sigma \{x \leadsto 0, y \leadsto 1\})
```

Solution: The old bindings of local variables must be restored even when the result is in $\{abort\} \times \Sigma$.

Use yet another lifting function to restore bindings: if $f \in \Sigma \to \Sigma$, then $f_{\dagger} \in \hat{\Sigma}_{\perp} \to \hat{\Sigma}_{\perp}$.

$$f_{\dagger} \perp = \perp \ f_{\dagger} \ (\mathsf{abort}, \sigma) = (\mathsf{abort}, f \ \sigma) \ f_{\dagger} \ \sigma = f \ \sigma$$

Then
$$[\![\mathbf{newvar}\ x := e\ \mathbf{in}\ c]\!]_{comm} \sigma$$

$$\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ((-)\{x \leadsto \sigma x\})_{\dagger} ([\![c]\!]_{comm} (\sigma \{x \leadsto [\![e]\!]_{intexp} \sigma \}))$$