# Semantics of Programming Languages

Exercise Sheet 4

From this sheet onward, you should write all your (non-trivial) proofs in Isar!

#### Exercise 4.1 Rule Inversion

Recall the evenness predicate ev from the lecture:

```
inductive ev :: "nat \Rightarrow bool" where ev\theta : "ev \theta" \mid evSS : "ev n \Longrightarrow ev (Suc (Suc n))"
```

Prove the converse of rule evSS using rule inversion. Hint: There are two ways to proceed. First, you can write a structured Isar-style proof using the cases method:

```
\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{lemma} \ \ "ev \ (Suc \ (Suc \ n)) \implies ev \ n" \\ \mathbf{proof} \ - \\ \mathbf{assume} \ \ "ev \ (Suc \ (Suc \ n))" \ \mathbf{then \ show} \ "ev \ n" \\ \mathbf{proof} \ (cases) \\ \cdots \\ \mathbf{qed} \\ \mathbf{qed} \end{array}
```

Alternatively, you can write a more automated proof by using the **inductive\_cases** command to generate elimination rules. These rules can then be used with "auto elim:". (If given the [elim] attribute, auto will use them by default.)

```
inductive_cases evSS_elim: "ev (Suc (Suc n))"
```

Next, prove that the natural number three  $(Suc\ (Suc\ (Suc\ (Suc\ 0))))$  is not even. Hint: You may proceed either with a structured proof, or with an automatic one. An automatic proof may require additional elimination rules from **inductive\_cases**.

```
lemma "\neg ev (Suc (Suc (Suc 0)))"
```

# Exercise 4.2 (Deterministic) Labelled Transition Systems (LTS)

A labelled transition system is a directed graph with labelled edges. We model such systems as functions:

```
type_synonym ('q,'l) lts = "'q \Rightarrow 'l \Rightarrow 'q \Rightarrow bool"
```

For an LTS  $\delta$  over nodes of type 'q and labels of type 'l,  $\delta$  p l q means that there is an edge from p to q labelled with l.

A word from source node u to target node v is the list of edge labels one encounters when going from u to v.

Define an inductive predicate word, such that word  $\delta$  u w v holds iff w is a word from u to v.

```
inductive word :: "('q,'l) lts \Rightarrow 'q \Rightarrow 'l list \Rightarrow 'q \Rightarrow bool" for \delta
```

A deterministic LTS has at most one transition for each node and label

```
definition "det \delta \equiv \forall p \ l \ q1 \ q2. \delta \ p \ l \ q1 \wedge \delta \ p \ l \ q2 \longrightarrow q1 = q2"
```

Show that for a deterministic LTS, the same word from the same source node leads to at most one target node.

#### lemma

```
assumes det: "det \delta" shows "word \delta p ls q \Longrightarrow word \delta p ls q' \Longrightarrow q = q'"
```

### **Exercise 4.3** Counting Elements

Recall the count function, that counts how often a specified element occurs in a list:

```
fun count :: "'a \Rightarrow 'a \ list \Rightarrow nat" where
"count x \ [] = 0"

| "count x \ (y \# ys) = (if \ x=y \ then \ Suc \ (count \ x \ ys) \ else \ count \ x \ ys)"
```

Show that, if an element occurs in the list (its count is positive), the list can be split into a prefix not containing the element, the element itself, and a suffix containing the element one times less

#### lemma

```
assumes "count a xs = Suc \ n"
shows "\exists \ ps \ ss. \ xs = ps \ @ \ a \ \# \ ss \land \ count \ a \ ps = 0 \land \ count \ a \ ss = n"
```

### Homework 4.1 Product Construction for LTS

Submission until Wednesday, November 13, 23:59pm.

The product construction is a standard construction for the intersection of two lts. Define the transition relation prod of the product of two given transition systems.

```
inductive prod :: "('q_1,'l) lts \Rightarrow ('q_2,'l) lts \Rightarrow 'q_1 \times 'q_2 \Rightarrow 'l \Rightarrow 'q_1 \times 'q_2 \Rightarrow bool" for \delta_1 \delta_2
```

Show that your product only contains those words.

Hint: Make sure to set up the induction properly. When you explicitly state the arguments in a computation or rule induction, it might be necessary to then declare some of the variables in the arguments as arbitrary.

Also make sure to chain in the proper facts into your induction with  $using \dots$ 

```
theorem prod\_sound:

assumes "word (prod \ \delta_1 \ \delta_2) (p_1,p_2) ls \ (q_1,q_2)"

shows "word \delta_1 \ p_1 \ ls \ q_1 \ \land \ word \ \delta_2 \ p_2 \ ls \ q_2"
```

Now prove that your product accepts all words that occur in both lts.

Hint: You will need rule induction and rule inversion.

```
lemma prod\_complete:

assumes "word \delta_1 p_1 ls q_1"

and "word \delta_2 p_2 ls q_2"

shows "word (prod \ \delta_1 \ \delta_2) \ (p_1,p_2) \ ls \ (q_1,q_2)"

Finally, the single correctness statement follows:
```

```
corollary "\{w. \ word \ (prod \ \delta_1 \ \delta_2) \ (p_1,p_2) \ w \ (q_1,q_2)\} = \{w. \ word \ \delta_1 \ p_1 \ w \ q_1\} \cap \{w. \ word \ \delta_2 \ p_2 \ w \ q_2\}"
```

using prod\_sound prod\_complete by fast

## Homework 4.2 Minimal Compiler

Submission until Wednesday, November 13, 23:59pm.

Recall the *aexp* compiler with exceptions from the last tutorial.

We defined correctness of the compiled code as follows:

```
correct \ a \ ins \equiv \forall s \ stk. \ exec \ ins \ s \ stk = Some \ (aval \ a \ s \ \# \ stk)
```

We are also interested in optimal code. Show that any correct list of instructions needs to contain a LOAD instruction for every variable of an aexp.

Hint: Do a proof by contradiction, without induction. You will need auxiliary lemmas about *aval* and *exec* with changed state (those need induction).

```
theorem vars\_in\_ins:

assumes "x \in vars \ a"

shows "correct \ a \ ins \Longrightarrow LOAD \ x \in set \ ins"
```