Semantics of Programming Languages

Exercise Sheet 14

Exercise 14.1 Independence analysis

In this exercise you first prove that the execution of a command only depends on its used (i.e., read or assigned) variables. Then you use this to prove commutativity of sequential composition.

Note that this development is entirely done on the small-step semantics.

First show that arithmetic and boolean expressions only depend on the variables occuring in them

```
\mathbf{lemma} \ [\mathit{simp}] \colon \textit{``s1} = \mathit{s2} \ \mathit{on} \ \mathit{X} \Longrightarrow \mathit{vars} \ \mathit{a} \subseteq \mathit{X} \Longrightarrow \mathit{aval} \ \mathit{a} \ \mathit{s1} = \mathit{aval} \ \mathit{a} \ \mathit{s2''}
```

lemma [
$$simp$$
]: " $s1 = s2$ on $X \Longrightarrow vars$ $b \subseteq X \Longrightarrow bval$ b $s1 = bval$ b $s2$ "

Next, show that executing a command does not invent new variables

```
lemma vars\_subsetD[dest]: "(c, s) \rightarrow (c', s') \Longrightarrow vars c' \subseteq vars c"
```

And that the effect of a command is confined to its variables

```
lemma small_step_confinement: "(c, s) \rightarrow (c', s') \Longrightarrow s = s' on UNIV - vars c" lemma small_steps_confinement: "(c, s) \rightarrow *(c', s') \Longrightarrow s = s' on UNIV - vars c"
```

Hint: These proofs should go through (mostly) automatically by induction.

Now, we are ready to show that commands only depend on the variables they use:

lemma small_step_indep:

```
"(c, s) \to (c', s') \Longrightarrow s = t \text{ on } X \Longrightarrow vars \ c \subseteq X \Longrightarrow \exists \ t'. \ (c, t) \to (c', t') \land s' = t' \text{ on } X"

lemma small\_steps\_indep: "[(c, s) \to * (c', s'); \ s = t \text{ on } X; \ vars \ c \subseteq X]]

\Longrightarrow \exists \ t'. \ (c, t) \to * (c', t') \land s' = t' \text{ on } X"
```

Two lemmas that may prove useful for the next proof.

```
lemma small\_steps\_SeqE: "(c1 ;; c2, s) \rightarrow * (SKIP, s')

\Rightarrow \exists t. (c1, s) \rightarrow * (SKIP, t) \land (c2, t) \rightarrow * (SKIP, s')"

by (induction \ "c1 ;; c2" \ sSKIP \ s' \ arbitrary: c1 \ c2 \ rule: star\_induct)

(blast \ intro: \ star.step)
```

```
lemma small\_steps\_SeqI: "[(c1, s) \rightarrow * (SKIP, s'); (c2, s') \rightarrow * (SKIP, t)]

\implies (c1 ;; c2, s) \rightarrow * (SKIP, t)"

by (induction \ c1 \ s \ SKIP \ s' \ rule: \ star\_induct)

(auto \ intro: \ star.step)
```

As we operate on the small-step semantics we also need our own version of command equivalence. Two commands are equivalent iff a terminating run of one command implies a terminating run of the other command. And, of course the terminal state needs to be equal when started in the same state.

```
definition equiv\_com :: "com \Rightarrow com \Rightarrow bool" (infix "\sim_s" 50) where "c1 <math>\sim_s c2 \longleftrightarrow (\forall s \ t. \ (c1, s) \to * (SKIP, t) \longleftrightarrow (c2, s) \to * (SKIP, t))"
```

Show that we defined an equivalence relation

```
lemma ec\_refl[simp]: "equiv\_com c c" lemma ec\_sym: "equiv\_com c1 c2 \longleftrightarrow equiv\_com c2 c1" lemma ec\_trans[trans]: "equiv\_com c1 c2 \Longrightarrow equiv\_com c2 c3 \Longrightarrow equiv\_com c1 c3"
```

Note that our small-step equivalence matches the big-step equivalence

```
lemma "c1 \sim_s c2 \longleftrightarrow c1 \sim c2" unfolding equiv_com_def by (metis big_iff_small)
```

Finally, show that commands that share no common variables can be re-ordered

```
theorem Seq\_equiv\_Seq\_reorder:

assumes vars: "vars\ c1 \cap vars\ c2 = \{\}"

shows "(c1\ ;;\ c2) \sim_s (c2\ ;;\ c1)"

proof -
```

As the statement is symmetric, we can take a shortcut by only proving one direction:

```
fix c1 c2 s t assume Seq: "(c1 ;; c2, s) \rightarrow * (SKIP, t)" and vars: "vars c1 \cap vars c2 = {} have "(c2 ;; c1, s) \rightarrow * (SKIP, t)" } with vars show ?thesis unfolding equiv\_com\_def by (metis Int\_commute) qed
```

Homework 14.1 Fixed Point Theory

Submission until Tuesday, February 5, 2019, 10:00am.

The following is the (slightly modified) text of an old exam exercise. In a real exam, we would ask you to solve the exercise on paper. For now, you should still use Isabelle. We expect you to write a detailed Isar proof, with the same level of detail you would provide in a pen&paper proof. Only trivial proof steps should be discharged by automatic methods.

Let $f::'a \ set \Rightarrow 'a \ set$ be a monotonic function. Moreover, let x_0 be post-fixpoint of f, i.e. $x_0 \subseteq f \ x_0$. Prove:

$$\bigcup \{f^{i}(x_{0}) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \bigcup \{f^{i+1}(x_{0}) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

Hint: Set union satisfies the following properties:

upper
$$B \in A \Longrightarrow B \subseteq \bigcup A$$

least
$$(\bigwedge X. \ X \in A \Longrightarrow X \subseteq C) \Longrightarrow \bigcup A \subseteq C$$

In Isabelle:

theorem postfix_step: " $\bigcup \{(f^{\hat{i}})(x_0) \mid i :: nat. \ True\} \subseteq \bigcup \{(f^{\hat{i}}(Suc\ i))(x_0) \mid i :: nat. \ True\}$ "

In Isabelle the two properties are: Union_upper and Union_least.

Homework 14.2 Kleene Fixed Point Theorem

Submission until Tuesday, February 5, 2019, 10:00am.

In this homework, we are going to prove a particular version of the Kleene fixed-point theorem. You should work at the same level of detail as in the previous exercise. Assume we are given a continuous function f:

context

```
fixes f:: "'a set \Rightarrow 'a set" assumes continuous: "\bigwedge X. X \neq \{\} \Longrightarrow f (\bigcup X) = \bigcup (f`X)" begin
```

In the end we want to prove the following: $lfp f = \bigcup \{(f \hat{i}) \} | i. True \}$.

First show that continuity implies monotonicity. Hint: consider a 2-element set.

```
theorem mono: "x \subseteq y \Longrightarrow f \ x \subseteq f \ y"
```

From now, you can use the following lemma:

```
lemma lfp\_fold: "f(lfp f) = lfp f" using lfp\_unfold mono unfolding mono\_def by blast
```

Prove the first direction of the theorem. Hint: Show that every f^i is below $lfp\ f$.

```
theorem lfp\_ge: "\bigcup \{(f^{\hat{i}}) \} | i. True\} \subseteq lfp f"
```

Prove the other direction of the theorem. *Hint:* Exploit continuity.

```
theorem lfp_le: "lfp_f \subseteq \bigcup \{(f \hat{i}) \} | i. True\}" (is "\subseteq \bigcup ?S")
```

corollary

```
"lfp f = \bigcup \{(f \hat{i}) \} | i. True\}" using lfp_le lfp_ge ..
```