# CS 4110

# Programming Languages & Logics



# Command Equivalence

Intuitively, two commands are equivalent if they produce the same result under any store...

# Definition (Equivalence of commands)

Two commands c and c' are equivalent (written  $c \sim c'$ ) if, for any stores  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$ , we have

$$\langle \sigma, c \rangle \Downarrow \sigma' \iff \langle \sigma, c' \rangle \Downarrow \sigma'.$$

# Command Equivalence

For example, we can prove that every **while** command is equivalent to its "unrolling":

#### **Theorem**

For all  $b \in \mathbf{Bexp}$  and  $c \in \mathbf{Com}$ ,

while b do  $c \sim$  if b then (c; while b do c) else skip

#### Proof.

We show each implication separately...

• Q: Can you write a program that doesn't terminate?

• Q: Can you write a program that doesn't terminate?

• A: while true do skip

- Q: Can you write a program that doesn't terminate?
- A: while true do skip
- Q: Does this mean that IMP is Turing complete?

- Q: Can you write a program that doesn't terminate?
- A: while true do skip
- Q: Does this mean that IMP is Turing complete?
- A: Not quite... we also need to check the language is not finite state... but IMP has real mathematical integers.

- Q: Can you write a program that doesn't terminate?
- A: while true do skip
- Q: Does this mean that IMP is Turing complete?
- A: Not quite... we also need to check the language is not finite state... but IMP has real mathematical integers.
- Q: What if we replace Int with Int64?



- Q: Can you write a program that doesn't terminate?
- A: while true do skip
- Q: Does this mean that IMP is Turing complete?
- A: Not quite... we also need to check the language is not finite state... but IMP has real mathematical integers.
- Q: What if we replace Int with Int64?
- A: Then we would lose Turing completeness.

- Q: Can you write a program that doesn't terminate?
- A: while true do skip
- Q: Does this mean that IMP is Turing complete?
- A: Not quite... we also need to check the language is not finite state... but IMP has real mathematical integers.
- Q: What if we replace Int with Int64?
- A: Then we would lose Turing completeness.
- Q: How much space do we need to represent configurations during execution of an IMP program?

- Q: Can you write a program that doesn't terminate?
- A: while true do skip
- Q: Does this mean that IMP is Turing complete?
- A: Not quite... we also need to check the language is not finite state... but IMP has real mathematical integers.
- Q: What if we replace Int with Int64?
- A: Then we would lose Turing completeness.
- Q: How much space do we need to represent configurations during execution of an IMP program?
- A: Can calculate a fixed bound!

# Determinism

#### Theorem

 $\forall c \in \mathsf{Com}, \sigma, \sigma' \sigma'' \in \mathsf{Store}.$ 

if  $\langle \sigma, c \rangle \Downarrow \sigma'$  and  $\langle \sigma, c \rangle \Downarrow \sigma''$  then  $\sigma' = \sigma''$ .

5

#### **Determinism**

#### Theorem

 $\forall c \in \mathsf{Com}, \sigma, \sigma' \sigma'' \in \mathsf{Store}.$ 

if  $\langle \sigma, c \rangle \Downarrow \sigma'$  and  $\langle \sigma, c \rangle \Downarrow \sigma''$  then  $\sigma' = \sigma''$ .

#### Proof.

By structural induction on c...

5

### **Determinism**

#### Theorem

 $\forall c \in \mathbf{Com}, \sigma, \sigma' \sigma'' \in \mathbf{Store}.$ 

if  $\langle \sigma, c \rangle \Downarrow \sigma'$  and  $\langle \sigma, c \rangle \Downarrow \sigma''$  then  $\sigma' = \sigma''$ .

#### Proof.

By structural induction on c...

## Proof.

By induction on the derivation of  $\langle \sigma, c \rangle \Downarrow \sigma'$ ...

# **Derivations**

Write  $\mathcal{D} \Vdash y$  if the conclusion of derivation  $\mathcal{D}$  is y.

### **Derivations**

Write  $\mathcal{D} \Vdash y$  if the conclusion of derivation  $\mathcal{D}$  is y.

#### Example:

Given the derivation,

we would write:  $\mathcal{D} \Vdash \langle \sigma, i := 42 \rangle \Downarrow \sigma[i \mapsto 42]$ 

Given a set of axioms and inference rules, the set of derivations is itself an inductively defined set!

Given a set of axioms and inference rules, the set of derivations is itself an inductively defined set!

This means we can prove properties by induction on derivations!

Given a set of axioms and inference rules, the set of derivations is itself an inductively defined set!

This means we can prove properties by induction on derivations!

A derivation  $\mathcal{D}'$  is an immediate subderivation of  $\mathcal{D}$  if  $\mathcal{D}' \Vdash z$  where z is one of the premises used of the final rule of derivation  $\mathcal{D}$ .

Given a set of axioms and inference rules, the set of derivations is itself an inductively defined set!

This means we can prove properties by induction on derivations!

A derivation  $\mathcal{D}'$  is an immediate subderivation of  $\mathcal{D}$  if  $\mathcal{D}' \Vdash z$  where z is one of the premises used of the final rule of derivation  $\mathcal{D}$ .

In a proof by induction on derivations, for every inference rule, assume that the property *P* holds for all immediate subderivations, and show that it holds of the conclusion.

# Large-Step Semantics

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{SKIP} & \frac{\langle \sigma, a \rangle \Downarrow n}{\langle \sigma, \mathsf{skip} \rangle \Downarrow \sigma} & \mathsf{ASSGN} \frac{\langle \sigma, a \rangle \Downarrow n}{\langle \sigma, x := a \rangle \Downarrow \sigma[x \mapsto n]} \\ & \mathsf{SEQ} & \frac{\langle \sigma, c_1 \rangle \Downarrow \sigma' & \langle \sigma', c_2 \rangle \Downarrow \sigma''}{\langle \sigma, c_1; c_2 \rangle \Downarrow \sigma''} \\ & \mathsf{IF-T} & \frac{\langle \sigma, b \rangle \Downarrow \mathsf{true} & \langle \sigma, c_1 \rangle \Downarrow \sigma'}{\langle \sigma, \mathsf{if} \ b \ \mathsf{then} \ c_1 \ \mathsf{else} \ c_2 \rangle \Downarrow \sigma'} \\ & \mathsf{IF-F} & \frac{\langle \sigma, b \rangle \Downarrow \mathsf{false} & \langle \sigma, c_2 \rangle \Downarrow \sigma'}{\langle \sigma, \mathsf{if} \ b \ \mathsf{then} \ c_1 \ \mathsf{else} \ c_2 \rangle \Downarrow \sigma'} \\ & \mathsf{WHILE-T} & \frac{\langle \sigma, b \rangle \Downarrow \mathsf{true} & \langle \sigma, c \rangle \Downarrow \sigma' & \langle \sigma', \mathsf{while} \ b \ \mathsf{do} \ c \rangle \Downarrow \sigma''}{\langle \sigma, \mathsf{while} \ b \ \mathsf{do} \ c \rangle \Downarrow \sigma''} \\ & \mathsf{WHILE-F} & \frac{\langle \sigma, b \rangle \Downarrow \mathsf{false}}{\langle \sigma, \mathsf{while} \ b \ \mathsf{do} \ c \rangle \Downarrow \sigma''} \\ & \mathsf{WHILE-F} & \frac{\langle \sigma, b \rangle \Downarrow \mathsf{false}}{\langle \sigma, \mathsf{while} \ b \ \mathsf{do} \ c \rangle \Downarrow \sigma''} \end{aligned}$$

8