## 1 Introduction

So far the most interesting thing we have given a denotational semantics for is the **while** loop. What about functions? We now have enough machinery to capture some of their semantics, even for mutually recursive functions. We show how to give a semantics for the language REC, found in Winskel Ch. 9.

# 2 Denotational Semantics for REC

### 2.1 REC Syntax

The functions in d ("declarations") are mutually recursive. It is reasonable to expect that under most semantics, let  $f_1(x_1) = f_1(x_1)$  in  $f_1(0)$  will loop infinitely, but let  $f_1(x_1) = f_1(x_1)$  in 0 will halt and return 0.

For example,

#### $\mathbf{let}$

### $f_2(1000)$

In this REC program,  $f_2(n)$  finds the first prime number  $p \ge n$ . (The value of  $n - m * (n \operatorname{\mathbf{div}} m)$  is positive iff m does not divide n).

#### 2.2 CBV Denotational Semantics for REC

The meaning function is  $\llbracket e \rrbracket \in FEnv \to Env \to \mathbb{Z}_{\perp}$ , where FEnv and Env denote the sets of variable environments and function environments, respectively, as used in REC.

$$\rho \in Env = \mathbf{Var} \to \mathbb{Z} 
\phi \in FEnv = (\mathbb{Z}^{a_1} \to \mathbb{Z}_{\perp}) \times \cdots \times (\mathbb{Z}^{a_n} \to \mathbb{Z}_{\perp})$$

Here **Var** is a countable set of variables,  $\mathbb{Z}$  is the set of integers, which are the values that can be bound to a variable in an environment, and  $\mathbb{Z}^m = \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}$ .

m times

$$\llbracket n \rrbracket \phi \rho = \lfloor n \rfloor$$
$$\llbracket x \rrbracket \phi \rho = \lfloor \rho(x) \rfloor$$
$$\llbracket e_1 \oplus e_2 \rrbracket \phi \rho = \operatorname{let} v_1 \in \mathbb{Z} = \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket \phi \rho \text{ in}$$
$$\operatorname{let} v_2 \in \mathbb{Z} = \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket \phi \rho \text{ in}$$
$$v_1 \oplus v_2$$
$$= \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket \phi \rho \oplus_{\perp} \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket \phi \rho$$
$$\llbracket \operatorname{let} x = e_1 \text{ in } e_2 \rrbracket \phi \rho = \operatorname{let} y \in \mathbb{Z} = \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket \phi \rho \text{ in}$$
$$\llbracket e_2 \rrbracket \phi \rho[x \mapsto y]$$
$$\llbracket \text{ifp } e_0 \text{ then } e_1 \text{ else } e_2 \rrbracket \phi \rho = \operatorname{let} v_0 \in \mathbb{Z} = \llbracket e_0 \rrbracket \phi \rho \text{ in}$$
$$\operatorname{if} v_0 > 0 \text{ then } \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket \phi \rho \text{ else } \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket \phi \rho$$
$$\llbracket f_i(e_1, \dots, e_{a_i}) \rrbracket \phi \rho = \operatorname{let} v_1 \in \mathbb{Z} = \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket \phi \rho \text{ in}$$
$$\vdots$$
$$\operatorname{let} v_{a_i} \in \mathbb{Z} = \llbracket e_{a_i} \rrbracket \phi \rho \text{ in}$$
$$(\pi_i \phi) \langle v_1, \dots, v_{a_i} \rangle$$

The meaning of a program let d in e is  $\llbracket e \rrbracket \phi \rho$ , where  $\rho$  is some initial environment containing default values for the variables, and

$$\phi = fix \ \lambda F \in FEnv. \ \langle \lambda v \in \mathbb{Z}^{a_1} \cdot \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket F \ \rho[x_1 \mapsto \pi_1(v), \dots, x_{a_1} \mapsto \pi_{a_1}(v)],$$
  
$$\vdots$$
  
$$\lambda v \in \mathbb{Z}^{a_n} \cdot \llbracket e_n \rrbracket F \ \rho[x_1 \mapsto \pi_1(v_1), \dots, x_{a_n} \mapsto \pi_{a_n}(v)] \rangle.$$

For this fixed point to exist, we need to know that FEnv is a pointed CPO. But FEnv is a product, and a product is a pointed CPO when each factor is a pointed CPO. Each factor  $\mathbb{Z}^{a_i} \to \mathbb{Z}_{\perp}$  is a pointed CPO, since a function is a pointed CPO when the codomain of that function is a pointed CPO, and  $\mathbb{Z}_{\perp}$  is a pointed CPO. Therefore, FEnv is a pointed CPO.

We also need to know that the function  $FEnv \rightarrow FEnv$  to which we are applying fix is continuous. It is because is written using the metalanguage.

#### 2.3 CBN Denotational Semantics

The denotational semantics for CBN is the same as for CBV with two exceptions:

$$\begin{split} \llbracket \mathbf{let} \ x &= e_1 \ \mathbf{in} \ e_2 \rrbracket \phi \rho &= \ \llbracket e_2 \rrbracket \phi \rho [x \mapsto \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket \phi \rho] \\ \\ \llbracket f_i(e_1, \dots, e_{a_i}) \rrbracket \phi \rho &= \ (\pi_i \ \phi) \langle \llbracket e_1 \rrbracket \phi \rho, \dots, \llbracket e_{a_i} \rrbracket \phi \rho \rangle. \end{split}$$

In fact, the lazy semantics is shorter than the eager semantics. This is because we had to explicitly "code up" strictness, whereas it came from free in the math representation, since mathematics is happy to ignore nontermination.

### 2.4 Comments

These semantics tell us something some interesting things about the language. To ensure that we could take a fixed point, we had to make the codomains of the representations of the  $f_i$  pointed—we were forced to recognize the possibility of nontermination. This is one of the nice properties of denotational semantics. Fixed-point semantics also tell us something interesting about compilation. As a rule of thumb, the presence of a fixed point tells us when we will have to build a cyclical data structure within our compiler, and backpatching will be needed to create the cycle. We can see this if we imagine what data structure within the compiler we would need to use to represent the structure  $\phi$ . The code for each of the  $f_i$ , which *phi* would point to, in turn points back to  $\phi$ . In a sense, the ability to take a fixed point tells us when we will succeed in backpatching the pointer that makes the cycle before that pointer needs to be used!