

Semantics of Programming Languages

Exercise Sheet 6

Exercise 6.1 Compiler optimization

A common programming idiom is *IF b THEN c*, i.e., the else-branch consists of a single *SKIP* command.

1. Look at how the program *IF Less (V "x") (N 5) THEN "y" ::= N 3 ELSE SKIP* is compiled by *ccomp* and identify a possible compiler optimization.
2. Implement an optimized compiler (by modifying *ccomp*) which reduces the number of instructions for programs of the form *IF b THEN c*.
3. Extend the proof of *comp-bigstep* to your modified compiler.

Exercise 6.2 Type coercions

Adding and comparing integers and reals can be allowed by introducing implicit conversions: Adding an integer and a real results in a real value, comparing an integer and a real can be done by first converting the integer into a real. Implicit conversions like this are called *coercions*.

1. Modify, in the theory *HOL-IMP.Types* (copy it first), the inductive definitions of *taval* and *tbval* such that implicit coercions are applied where necessary.
2. Adapt all proofs in the theory *HOL-IMP.Types* accordingly.

Hint: Isabelle already provides the coercion function *real_of_int* ($int \Rightarrow real$).

Homework 6.1 Pairs

Submission until Monday, December 6, 10:00am.

In this exercise, we extend the expression language of *IMP* with pair values.

datatype *val* = *Iv int* | *Pv val val*

type_synonym *vname* = *string*

type_synonym *state* = "*vname* \Rightarrow *val*"

datatype *aexp* = *N int* | *V vname* | *Plus aexp aexp* | *Pair aexp aexp*

Complete the following inductive predicate for evaluating expressions:

inductive *taval* :: "*aexp* \Rightarrow *state* \Rightarrow *val* \Rightarrow *bool*" **where**

"*taval* (*N i*) *s* (*Iv i*)" |

"*taval* (*V x*) *s* (*s x*)" |

It should also be able to add pairs. In this case, the addition should be performed pair-wise. This should also work for nested pairs.

For simplicity, we do not modify Boolean expressions. *Less* can only compare two integer values:

datatype *bexp* = *Bc bool* | *Not bexp* | *And bexp bexp* | *Less aexp aexp*

inductive *tbval* :: "*bexp* \Rightarrow *state* \Rightarrow *bool* \Rightarrow *bool*" **where**

"*tbval* (*Bc v*) *s* *v*" |

"*tbval* *b s bv* \Rightarrow *tbval* (*Not b*) *s* (\neg *bv*)" |

"*tbval* *b1 s bv1* \Rightarrow *tbval* *b2 s bv2* \Rightarrow *tbval* (*And b1 b2*) *s* (*bv1* & *bv2*)" |

"*taval* *a1 s* (*Iv i1*) \Rightarrow *taval* *a2 s* (*Iv i2*) \Rightarrow *tbval* (*Less a1 a2*) *s* (*i1* < *i2*)"

We add an assignment construct for pairs $(x, y) ::= a$ to the command language:

datatype

com = *SKIP*

| *Assign vname aexp* ("*_ ::= _*" [1000, 61] 61)

| *AssignP "vname \times vname" aexp* ("*_ ::= _*" [1000, 61] 61)

| *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)

Adopt the small-step semantics accordingly:

inductive

small_step :: "*(com \times state)* \Rightarrow *(com \times state)* \Rightarrow *bool*" (**infix** " \rightarrow " 55)

We now also add a pair type to the typing system:

datatype *ty* = *Ity* | *Pty ty ty*

type_synonym *tyenv* = “*vname* \Rightarrow *ty*”

Complete the typing rules:

inductive *atyping* :: “*tyenv* \Rightarrow *aexp* \Rightarrow *ty* \Rightarrow *bool*”
 (“(1_/ \vdash / (_ : / _)” [50,0,50] 50)

where

Ic_ty: “ $\Gamma \vdash N\ i : Ity$ ” |

V_ty: “ $\Gamma \vdash V\ x : \Gamma\ x$ ” |

inductive *btyping* :: “*tyenv* \Rightarrow *bexp* \Rightarrow *bool*” (**infix** “ \vdash ” 50)

where

B_ty: “ $\Gamma \vdash Bc\ v$ ” |

Not_ty: “ $\Gamma \vdash b \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash Not\ b$ ” |

And_ty: “ $\Gamma \vdash b1 \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash b2 \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash And\ b1\ b2$ ” |

inductive *ctyping* :: “*tyenv* \Rightarrow *com* \Rightarrow *bool*” (**infix** “ \vdash ” 50) **where**

Skip_ty: “ $\Gamma \vdash SKIP$ ” |

Assign_ty: “ $\Gamma \vdash a : \Gamma(x) \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash x ::= a$ ” |

Seq_ty: “ $\Gamma \vdash c1 \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash c2 \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash c1;;c2$ ” |

If_ty: “ $\Gamma \vdash b \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash c1 \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash c2 \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash IF\ b\ THEN\ c1\ ELSE\ c2$ ” |

While_ty: “ $\Gamma \vdash b \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash c \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash WHILE\ b\ DO\ c$ ” |

This function determines the type of a value:

fun *type* :: “*val* \Rightarrow *ty*” **where**

“*type* (*Iv* *i*) = *Ity*” |

“*type* (*Pv* *v1* *v2*) = *Pty* (*type* *v1*) (*type* *v2*)”

lemma *type_eq_Ity[simp]*: “*type* *v* = *Ity* \longleftrightarrow ($\exists i. v = Iv\ i$)”

by (*cases* *v*) *simp_all*

Hint: You will also need a similar lemma for *Pty* *t1* *t2*.

definition *styping* :: “*tyenv* \Rightarrow *state* \Rightarrow *bool*” (**infix** “ \vdash ” 50)

where “ $\Gamma \vdash s \longleftrightarrow (\forall x. type\ (s\ x) = \Gamma\ x)$ ”

Complete the proofs of preservation and progress:

lemma *apreservation*:

“ $\Gamma \vdash a : \tau \Longrightarrow taval\ a\ s\ v \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash s \Longrightarrow type\ v = \tau$ ”

lemma *aprogress*: “ $\Gamma \vdash a : \tau \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash s \Longrightarrow \exists v. taval\ a\ s\ v$ ”

lemma *bprogress*: “ $\Gamma \vdash b \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash s \Longrightarrow \exists v. tbval\ b\ s\ v$ ”

theorem *progress*:

“ $\Gamma \vdash c \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash s \Longrightarrow c \neq SKIP \Longrightarrow \exists cs'. (c,s) \rightarrow cs'$ ”

theorem *styping_preservation*:

“ $(c,s) \rightarrow (c',s') \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash c \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash s \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash s'$ ”

theorem *ctyping_preservation*:

“ $(c,s) \rightarrow (c',s') \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash c \Longrightarrow \Gamma \vdash c'$ ”

abbreviation *small_steps* :: “*com* * *state* \Rightarrow *com* * *state* \Rightarrow *bool*” (**infix** “ \rightarrow^* ” 55)

where “ $x \rightarrow^* y == \text{star_small_step } x \ y$ ”

Finally, we can recover the proof of type-soundness:

theorem *type_sound*:

“ $(c,s) \rightarrow^* (c',s') \implies \Gamma \vdash c \implies \Gamma \vdash s \implies c' \neq \text{SKIP}$
 $\implies \exists cs''. (c',s') \rightarrow cs''$ ”

apply(*induction rule:star_induct*)

apply (*metis progress*)

by (*metis styping_preservation ctyping_preservation*)

Homework 6.2 Continue

Submission until Monday, December 2, 10:00am.

Your task is to add a continue command to the IMP language. The continue command should skip all remaining commands in the innermost while loop.

The new command datatype is:

datatype

com = *SKIP*

| *Assign vname aexp* (“_ ::= _” [1000, 61] 61)

| *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)

| *CONTINUE*

The idea of the big-step semantics is to return not only a state, but also a continue flag, which indicates that a continue has been triggered. Modify/augment the big-step rules accordingly:

inductive

big_step :: “ $com \times state \Rightarrow bool \times state \Rightarrow bool$ ” (**infix** “ \Rightarrow ” 55)

Your next task is to adopt the compiler such that *CONTINUE* is also supported. The now compiler will have the following signature:

fun *ccomp* :: “ $com \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow instr \ list$ ” **where**

The extra argument keeps track of the offset from the head of the last preceding while-loop.

To improve automation, first prove the following lemma:

definition

“ $len_of \ c = length \ (ccomp \ c \ 0)$ ”

lemma *length_ccomp[simp]*:

“ $length \ (ccomp \ c \ i) = len_of \ c$ ”

Now show that your new compiler is correct. To do so, prove the following modified correctness lemma. The modified lemma adds an instruction prefix pre , which you can think of as the list of instructions that separates the current instruction and the last loop head.

Note that the original proof made us of heavy automation that is likely going to break after making the changes from above. Use Isar to explore the proof in more detail.

lemma *ccomp_bigstep1*:

$$\begin{aligned} &“(c,s) \Rightarrow (f, t) \Longrightarrow i \leq \text{length } pre \\ &\Longrightarrow pre \ @ \ ccomp \ c \ i \vdash \\ &\quad (\text{length } pre, s, stk) \rightarrow^* (\text{if } f \text{ then } \text{length } pre - i \text{ else } \text{size}(pre \ @ \ ccomp \ c \ i), t, stk)” \end{aligned}$$

Finally, re-prove the old correctness theorem:

corollary *ccomp_bigstep*:

$$“(c,s) \Rightarrow (False, t) \Longrightarrow ccomp \ c \ 0 \vdash (0, s, stk) \rightarrow^* (\text{size}(ccomp \ c \ 0), t, stk)”$$