# Semantics of Programming Languages

Exercise Sheet 08

Exercise 8.1 Knaster-Tarski Fixed Point Theorem

The Knaster-Tarski theorem tells us that for each set P of fixed points of a monotone function f we have a fixpoint of f which is a greatest lower bound of P. In this exercise, we want to prove the Knaster-Tarski theorem.

First we give a construction of the greatest lower bound of all fixed points P of the function f. This is the union of all sets u smaller than P and f u. Then the task is to show that this is a fixed point, and that it is the greatest lower bound of all sets in P. Let us define  $Inf_{-}fixp$ :

**definition** Inf\_fixp :: "('a set  $\Rightarrow$  'a set)  $\Rightarrow$  'a set set  $\Rightarrow$  'a set" where "Inf\_fixp  $f P = \bigcup \{u. \ u \subseteq \bigcap P \cap f u \}$ "

To work directly with this definition is a little cumbersome, we propose to use the following two theorems:

**lemma** Inf\_fixp\_upperbound: " $X \subseteq \bigcap P \implies X \subseteq f X \implies X \subseteq$  Inf\_fixp f P" by (auto simp: Inf\_fixp\_def)

**lemma** Inf\_fixp\_least: " $(\bigwedge u. u \subseteq \bigcap P \Longrightarrow u \subseteq f u \Longrightarrow u \subseteq X) \Longrightarrow$  Inf\_fixp  $f P \subseteq X$ " by (auto simp: Inf\_fixp\_def)

Now prove, that  $Inf_{-fixp}$  is acually a fixed point of f.

*Hint:* First prove  $Inf_{fixp} f P \subseteq f$  ( $Inf_{fixp} f P$ ), this will be used for the other direction. It may be helpful to first think about the structure of your proof using pen-and-paper and then translate it into Isar.

**lemma** Inf\_fixp: **assumes** f: "mono f" **assumes** P: " $\land p. p \in P \Longrightarrow f p = p$ " **shows** "Inf\_fixp f P = f (Inf\_fixp f P)"

Now we prove that it is a lower bound:

lemma  $Inf_fixp_lower$ : " $Inf_fixp f P \subseteq \bigcap P$ "

And that it is the greatest lower bound:

lemma  $Inf_fixp_greatest$ : assumes "f q = q" " $q \subseteq \bigcap P$ " shows " $q \subseteq Inf_fixp f P$ "

### Exercise 8.2 Denotational Semantics

Define a denotational semantics for REPEAT-loops, and show its equivalence to the bigstep semantics.

datatype com = SKIP

Assign vname aexp	$("_{-} ::= \_" [1000, 61] 61)$
$\mid Seq  com  com$	("-;;/-" [60, 61] 60)
If bexp com com	$("(IF _/ THEN _/ ELSE _)" [0, 0, 61] 61)$
While bexp com	$("(WHILE _/ DO _)" [0, 61] 61)$
Repeat com bexp	$("(REPEAT _/ UNTIL _)" [0, 61] 61)$

#### inductive

 $\begin{array}{l} big\_step :: "com \times state \Rightarrow state \Rightarrow bool" (infix "\Rightarrow" 55) \\ \textbf{where} \\ Skip: "(SKIP,s) \Rightarrow s" \mid \\ Assign: "(x ::= a,s) \Rightarrow s(x := aval a s)" \mid \\ Seq: "[[(c_1,s_1) \Rightarrow s_2; (c_2,s_2) \Rightarrow s_3]] \Longrightarrow (c_1;;c_2, s_1) \Rightarrow s_3" \mid \\ IfTrue: "[[bval b s; (c_1,s) \Rightarrow t]] \Longrightarrow (IF b THEN c_1 ELSE c_2, s) \Rightarrow t" \mid \\ IfFalse: "[[\neg bval b s; (c_2,s) \Rightarrow t]] \Longrightarrow (IF b THEN c_1 ELSE c_2, s) \Rightarrow t" \mid \\ WhileFalse: "\neg bval b s \Longrightarrow (WHILE b DO c, s) \Rightarrow s" \mid \\ WhileTrue: "[[bval b s_1; (c,s_1) \Rightarrow s_2; (WHILE b DO c, s_2) \Rightarrow s_3]] \\ \Longrightarrow (WHILE b DO c, s_1) \Rightarrow s_3" \end{array}$ 

Proof automation:

**lemmas** [*intro*] = *big\_step.intros* **lemmas** *big\_step\_induct* = *big\_step.induct*[*split\_format(complete)*]

inductive\_cases SkipE[elim!]: " $(SKIP,s) \Rightarrow t$ " inductive\_cases AssignE[elim!]: " $(x ::= a,s) \Rightarrow t$ " inductive\_cases SeqE[elim!]: " $(c1;;c2,s1) \Rightarrow s3$ " inductive\_cases IfE[elim!]: " $(IF \ b \ THEN \ c1 \ ELSE \ c2,s) \Rightarrow t$ " inductive\_cases WhileE[elim]: " $(WHILE \ b \ DO \ c,s) \Rightarrow t$ "

Execution is deterministic:

**theorem**  $big\_step\_determ$ : " $\llbracket (c,s) \Rightarrow t$ ;  $(c,s) \Rightarrow u \rrbracket \Longrightarrow u = t$ " by (induction arbitrary: u rule:  $big\_step\_induct$ ) blast+

**type\_synonym**  $com_den = "(state \times state) set"$ 

**definition**  $W :: "(state \Rightarrow bool) \Rightarrow com\_den \Rightarrow (com\_den \Rightarrow com\_den)" where$  $"W db dc = (<math>\lambda dw$ . {(s,t). if db s then (s,t)  $\in$  dc O dw else s=t})"

fun D :: "com  $\Rightarrow$  com\_den" where "D SKIP = Id" | "D (x ::= a) = {(s,t). t = s(x := aval a s)}" | "D (c1;;c2) = D(c1) O D(c2)" | "D (IF b THEN c1 ELSE c2)  $= \{(s,t). if bval b s then (s,t) \in D c1 else (s,t) \in D c2\}" |$ "D (WHILE b DO c) = lfp (W (bval b) (D c))" lemma W\_mono: "mono (W b r)" by (unfold W\_def mono\_def) auto

**lemma**  $R_{-}mono:$  "mono  $(R \ b \ r)$ " **by** (unfold  $R_{-}def$  mono\_def) auto

lemma D\_While\_If: "D(WHILE b DO c) = D(IF b THEN c;;WHILE b DO c ELSE SKIP)" proof- let ?w = "WHILE b DO c" let ?f = "W (bval b) (D c)" have "D ?w = lfp ?f" by simp also have "... = ?f (lfp ?f)" by(rule lfp\_unfold [OF W\_mono]) also have "... = D(IF b THEN c;;?w ELSE SKIP)" by (simp add: W\_def) finally show ?thesis . qed

Equivalence of denotational and big-step semantics:

**abbreviation**  $Big\_step :: "com \Rightarrow com\_den"$  where " $Big\_step \ c \equiv \{(s,t), (c,s) \Rightarrow t\}$ "

**lemma**  $Big\_step\_if\_D$ : " $(s,t) \in D(c) \implies (s,t)$ :  $Big\_step\ c$ " **proof** (induction c arbitrary: s t) **case** Seq **thus** ?case **by** fastforce **next case** (While b c) **let** ?B = "Big\\_step (WHILE b DO c)" **let** ?f = "W (bval b) (D c)" **have** "?f ?B  $\subseteq$  ?B" **using** While.IH **by** (auto simp: W\_def) from lfp\\_lowerbound[**where** ?f = "?f", OF this] While.prems **show** ?case **by** auto **nextqed** (auto split: if\\_splits)

**theorem** denotational\_is\_big\_step: " $(s,t) \in D(c) = ((c,s) \Rightarrow t)$ " **by** (metis D\_if\_big\_step Big\_step\_if\_D[simplified])

## Homework 8.1 Be Original!

Submission until Sunday, Jan 10, 23:59. In total, this exercise is worth 15 points, plus bonus points for nice submissions.

You should now have a topic to formalize, for example:

- Prove some interesting result about algorithms/graphs/automata/formal language theory
- Formalize some results from mathematics
- Find interesting modifications of IMP material and prove interesting properties about them
- ...

Do the formalization! You can submit your work via the submission system or by email. You should set yourself a time limit before starting your project. Also incomplete/unfinished formalizations are welcome and will be graded!

Please comment your formalization well, such that we can see what it does/is intended to do.

# Merry Christmas!