

Lecture 8

Full Abstraction

Proof principle

For all types τ and closed terms $M_1, M_2 \in \text{PCF}_\tau$,

$$\llbracket M_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket \text{ in } \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \implies M_1 \cong_{\text{ctx}} M_2 : \tau .$$

Hence, to prove

$$M_1 \cong_{\text{ctx}} M_2 : \tau$$

it suffices to establish

$$\llbracket M_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket M_2 \rrbracket \text{ in } \llbracket \tau \rrbracket .$$

Full abstraction

A denotational model is said to be *fully abstract* whenever denotational equality characterises contextual equivalence.

- ▶ The domain model of **PCF** is *not* fully abstract.

In other words, there are contextually equivalent **PCF** terms with different denotations.

Failure of full abstraction, idea

We will construct two closed terms

$$T_1, T_2 \in \text{PCF}_{(bool \rightarrow (bool \rightarrow bool)) \rightarrow bool}$$

such that

$$T_1 \cong_{\text{ctx}} T_2$$

and

$$\llbracket T_1 \rrbracket \neq \llbracket T_2 \rrbracket$$

- ▶ We achieve $T_1 \cong_{\text{ctx}} T_2$ by making sure that

$$\forall M \in \text{PCF}_{\text{bool} \rightarrow (\text{bool} \rightarrow \text{bool})} \quad (T_1 M \not\approx_{\text{bool}} \& T_2 M \not\approx_{\text{bool}})$$

Hence,

$$\llbracket T_1 \rrbracket(\llbracket M \rrbracket) = \perp = \llbracket T_2 \rrbracket(\llbracket M \rrbracket)$$

for all $M \in \text{PCF}_{\text{bool} \rightarrow (\text{bool} \rightarrow \text{bool})}$.

- ▶ We achieve $\llbracket T_1 \rrbracket \neq \llbracket T_2 \rrbracket$ by making sure that

$$\llbracket T_1 \rrbracket(\text{por}) \neq \llbracket T_2 \rrbracket(\text{por})$$

for some *non-definable* continuous function

$$\text{por} \in (\mathbb{B}_\perp \rightarrow (\mathbb{B}_\perp \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_\perp)) .$$

Parallel-or function

is the unique continuous function $por : \mathbb{B}_\perp \rightarrow (\mathbb{B}_\perp \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_\perp)$ such that

$$por\ true\ \perp = true$$

$$por\ \perp\ true = true$$

$$por\ false\ false = false$$

In which case, it necessarily follows by monotonicity that

$$por\ true\ true = true \qquad por\ false\ \perp = \perp$$

$$por\ true\ false = true \qquad por\ \perp\ false = \perp$$

$$por\ false\ true = true \qquad por\ \perp\ \perp = \perp$$

Undefinability of parallel-or

Proposition. *There is no closed PCF term*

$$P : \text{bool} \rightarrow (\text{bool} \rightarrow \text{bool})$$

satisfying

$$\llbracket P \rrbracket = \text{por} : \mathbb{B}_\perp \rightarrow (\mathbb{B}_\perp \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_\perp) .$$

Parallel-or test functions

For $i = 1, 2$ define

```
 $T_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{fn } f : \text{bool} \rightarrow (\text{bool} \rightarrow \text{bool}).$   
    if ( $f$  true  $\Omega$ ) then  
        if ( $f$   $\Omega$  true) then  
            if ( $f$  false false) then  $\Omega$  else  $B_i$   
        else  $\Omega$   
    else  $\Omega$ 
```

where $B_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{true}$, $B_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{false}$,
and $\Omega \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{fix}(\text{fn } x : \text{bool}. x)$.

Failure of full abstraction

Proposition.

$$T_1 \cong_{\text{ctx}} T_2 : (bool \rightarrow (bool \rightarrow bool)) \rightarrow bool$$

$$\llbracket T_1 \rrbracket \neq \llbracket T_2 \rrbracket \in (\mathbb{B}_\perp \rightarrow (\mathbb{B}_\perp \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_\perp)) \rightarrow \mathbb{B}_\perp$$

PCF+por

Expressions $M ::= \dots \mid \mathbf{por}(M, M)$

Typing
$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash M_1 : \mathit{bool} \quad \Gamma \vdash M_2 : \mathit{bool}}{\Gamma \vdash \mathbf{por}(M_1, M_2) : \mathit{bool}}$$

Evaluation

$M_1 \Downarrow_{\mathit{bool}} \mathbf{true}$

$M_2 \Downarrow_{\mathit{bool}} \mathbf{true}$

$\mathbf{por}(M_1, M_2) \Downarrow_{\mathit{bool}} \mathbf{true}$ $\mathbf{por}(M_1, M_2) \Downarrow_{\mathit{bool}} \mathbf{true}$

$M_1 \Downarrow_{\mathit{bool}} \mathbf{false}$ $M_2 \Downarrow_{\mathit{bool}} \mathbf{false}$

$\mathbf{por}(M_1, M_2) \Downarrow_{\mathit{bool}} \mathbf{false}$

Plotkin's full abstraction result

The denotational semantics of PCF+por is given by extending that of PCF with the clause

$$\llbracket \Gamma \vdash \mathbf{por}(M_1, M_2) \rrbracket(\rho) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathit{por}(\llbracket \Gamma \vdash M_1 \rrbracket(\rho))(\llbracket \Gamma \vdash M_2 \rrbracket(\rho))$$

This denotational semantics is fully abstract for contextual equivalence of PCF+por terms:

$$\Gamma \vdash M_1 \cong_{\text{ctx}} M_2 : \tau \Leftrightarrow \llbracket \Gamma \vdash M_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket \Gamma \vdash M_2 \rrbracket.$$