

Topic 7

Relating Denotational and Operational Semantics

Adequacy

For any closed PCF terms M and V of *ground* type $\gamma \in \{\text{nat}, \text{bool}\}$ with V a value

$$\llbracket M \rrbracket = \llbracket V \rrbracket \in \llbracket \gamma \rrbracket \implies M \Downarrow_{\gamma} V.$$

NB. Adequacy does not hold at function types:

$$\llbracket \text{fn } x : \tau. (\text{fn } y : \tau. y) x \rrbracket = \llbracket \text{fn } x : \tau. x \rrbracket : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket \tau \rrbracket$$

Two values with the same denotation
different

Adequacy

For any closed PCF terms M and V of *ground* type $\gamma \in \{nat, bool\}$ with V a value

$$\llbracket M \rrbracket = \llbracket V \rrbracket \in \llbracket \gamma \rrbracket \implies M \Downarrow_{\gamma} V.$$

NB. Adequacy does not hold at function types:

$$\llbracket \mathbf{fn} \ x : \tau. (\mathbf{fn} \ y : \tau. y) \ x \rrbracket = \llbracket \mathbf{fn} \ x : \tau. x \rrbracket : \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket \tau \rrbracket$$

but

$$\mathbf{fn} \ x : \tau. (\mathbf{fn} \ y : \tau. y) \ x \not\Downarrow_{\tau \rightarrow \tau} \mathbf{fn} \ x : \tau. x$$

$\llbracket M \rrbracket = \llbracket V \rrbracket \Rightarrow M \Downarrow V$

Adequacy proof idea

1. We cannot proceed to prove the adequacy statement by a straightforward induction on the structure of terms.

?

► Consider M to be $M_1 M_2, \text{fix}(M')$.

We cannot do induction

by ind.
 $\llbracket M_1 \rrbracket = \llbracket \text{fix}.M \rrbracket \Rightarrow \dots$

$$M_1 \Downarrow \text{fix}.M \quad M_2 \Downarrow V \quad \frac{M[x] \Downarrow V}{M_1 M_2 \Downarrow V}$$

$$\llbracket M_1 M_2 \rrbracket = \llbracket V \rrbracket \stackrel{?}{\Rightarrow} M_1 M_2 \Downarrow V$$

Adequacy proof idea

1. We cannot proceed to prove the adequacy statement by a straightforward induction on the structure of terms.
 - ▶ Consider M to be $M_1 M_2$, $\mathbf{fix}(M')$.
2. So we proceed to prove a stronger statement that applies to terms of arbitrary types and implies adequacy.

Adequacy proof idea

1. We cannot proceed to prove the adequacy statement by a straightforward induction on the structure of terms.

▶ Consider M to be $M_1 M_2$, $\mathbf{fix}(M')$.

2. So we proceed to prove a stronger statement that applies to terms of arbitrary types and implies adequacy.

This statement roughly takes the form:

$$\llbracket M \rrbracket \triangleleft_{\tau} M \text{ for all types } \tau \text{ and all } M \in \text{PCF}_{\tau}$$

where the *formal approximation relations*

proved by induction on the structure of terms. $\triangleleft_{\tau} \subseteq \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \times \text{PCF}_{\tau}$ are *logically* chosen to allow a proof by induction.

For $\tau = \text{nat}$
or bool

Adequacy

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma = \text{bool} \quad \mathbb{B}_\perp \ni \text{true} \quad \Delta_{\text{bool}} M &\iff M \Downarrow_{\text{bool}} \underline{\text{true}} \\ \mathbb{B}_\perp \ni \text{false} \quad \Delta_{\text{bool}} M &\iff M \Downarrow_{\text{bool}} \underline{\text{false}} \end{aligned}$$

Requirements on the formal approximation relations, I

We want that, for $\gamma \in \{\text{nat}, \text{bool}\}$,

$$\llbracket M \rrbracket \triangleleft_\gamma M \text{ implies } \underbrace{\forall V (\llbracket M \rrbracket = \llbracket V \rrbracket \implies M \Downarrow_\gamma V)}_{\text{adequacy}}$$

If $\llbracket M \rrbracket \triangleleft_{bool} M$ then $\forall V. \llbracket M \rrbracket = \llbracket V \rrbracket \Rightarrow M \Downarrow V$.

Definition of $d \triangleleft_{\gamma} M$ ($d \in \llbracket \gamma \rrbracket, M \in \text{PCF}_{\gamma}$) Adequacy
for $\gamma \in \{nat, bool\}$

$$n \triangleleft_{nat} M \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} (n \in \mathbb{N} \Rightarrow M \Downarrow_{nat} \mathbf{succ}^n(\mathbf{0}))$$

$$b \triangleleft_{bool} M \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} (b = true \Rightarrow M \Downarrow_{bool} \mathbf{true}) \\ \& (b = false \Rightarrow M \Downarrow_{bool} \mathbf{false})$$

$\boxed{?}$ $\triangleleft_{\tau} \tau' ?$

Proof of: $\llbracket M \rrbracket \triangleleft_\gamma M$ implies **adequacy**

Case $\gamma = \mathit{nat}$.

$$\llbracket M \rrbracket = \llbracket V \rrbracket$$

$$\implies \llbracket M \rrbracket = \llbracket \mathbf{succ}^n(\mathbf{0}) \rrbracket \quad \text{for some } n \in \mathbb{N}$$

$$\implies n = \llbracket M \rrbracket \triangleleft_\gamma M$$

$$\implies M \Downarrow \mathbf{succ}^n(\mathbf{0}) \quad \text{by definition of } \triangleleft_{\mathit{nat}}$$

Case $\gamma = \mathit{bool}$ is similar.

want to define $\Delta_{z \rightarrow z'}$

have $\llbracket M_1 M_2 \rrbracket \Delta_{z \rightarrow z'} M_1(M_2)$

$$\llbracket M_1 \rrbracket (\llbracket M_2 \rrbracket)$$

Requirements on the formal approximation relations, II

We want to be able to proceed by induction.

► Consider the case $M = M_1 M_2$.

By induction, $\llbracket M_1 \rrbracket \Delta_{z \rightarrow z'} M_1$

\rightsquigarrow logical definition

$\llbracket M_2 \rrbracket \Delta_z M_2$

$$\begin{array}{c} \llbracket z \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket z' \rrbracket \\ \Downarrow \\ f \Delta_{z \rightarrow z'} M_1 \end{array} \stackrel{?}{\iff} \forall x \Delta_z M_2. f(x) \Delta_{z'} M_1(M_2)$$

Definition of

$$f \triangleleft_{\tau \rightarrow \tau'} M \quad (f \in (\llbracket \tau \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket \tau' \rrbracket), M \in \text{PCF}_{\tau \rightarrow \tau'})$$

$$f \triangleleft_{\tau \rightarrow \tau'} M$$

$$\stackrel{\text{def}}{\Leftrightarrow} \forall x \in \llbracket \tau \rrbracket, N \in \text{PCF}_{\tau}$$

$$(x \triangleleft_{\tau} N \Rightarrow f(x) \triangleleft_{\tau'} M N)$$

Want that $\llbracket \underline{\text{fix}}(M') \rrbracket \Delta_z \underline{\text{fix}}(M')$

$\llbracket \underline{\text{fix}}(M) \rrbracket$

Need to prove a property of a fixed point

Requirements on the formal approximation relations, III point

We want to be able to proceed by induction.

We do it by

► Consider the case $M = \text{fix}(M')$.

Scott Induction

↪ admissibility property

which requires

$\{d \in \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \mid d \Delta_z M\}$

is admissible

Admissibility property

Lemma. For all types τ and $M \in \text{PCF}_\tau$, the set

$$\{d \in \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \mid d \triangleleft_\tau M\} \quad \perp \quad \Delta_{\tau} M$$

is an admissible subset of $\llbracket \tau \rrbracket$.

i.e. (n ∈ ℕ)

$$d_0 \sqsubseteq d_1 \sqsubseteq \dots \sqsubseteq d_n \sqsubseteq \dots$$

$$\left(\forall i \quad d_i \triangleleft_\tau M \right) \Rightarrow \bigsqcup_i d_i \triangleleft_\tau M$$

$\{d \in \llbracket \tau \rrbracket \mid d \triangleleft_{\tau} M\}$ is downwards closed

Further properties

Lemma. For all types τ , elements $d, d' \in \llbracket \tau \rrbracket$, and terms $M, N, V \in \text{PCF}_{\tau}$,

1. If $d \sqsubseteq d'$ and $d' \triangleleft_{\tau} M$ then $d \triangleleft_{\tau} M$.
2. If $d \triangleleft_{\tau} M$ and $\forall V (M \Downarrow_{\tau} V \implies N \Downarrow_{\tau} V)$ then $d \triangleleft_{\tau} N$.

Want to prove $\llbracket \text{fn } x.M \rrbracket \triangleleft_{z \rightarrow z'} \underline{\text{fn } x.M}$
 \parallel

$$f = \lambda d \in \llbracket z \rrbracket. \llbracket x:z \vdash M \rrbracket [x \mapsto d]$$

Requirements on the formal approximation relations, IV

We want to be able to proceed by induction.

► Consider the case $M = \text{fn } x : \tau . M'$.

\rightsquigarrow substitutivity property for open terms

$$\text{iff } \forall d \in z \mathcal{N}. f(d) \triangleleft_{z'} (\underline{\text{fn } x.M})(\mathcal{N})$$

$$\llbracket x:z \vdash M \rrbracket [x \mapsto d]$$

by previous lemma we want
 $\llbracket z \vdash M \rrbracket [x \mapsto d] \triangleleft M[\mathcal{N}/x]$

$$M[\mathcal{N}/x] \Downarrow v \Rightarrow (\underline{\text{fn } x.M})(\mathcal{N}) \Downarrow v$$

Fundamental property

Theorem. For all $\Gamma = \langle x_1 \mapsto \tau_1, \dots, x_n \mapsto \tau_n \rangle$ and all $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$, if $d_1 \triangleleft_{\tau_1} M_1, \dots, d_n \triangleleft_{\tau_n} M_n$ then $\llbracket \Gamma \vdash M \rrbracket [x_1 \mapsto d_1, \dots, x_n \mapsto d_n] \triangleleft_{\tau} M[M_1/x_1, \dots, M_n/x_n]$.

NB. The case $\Gamma = \emptyset$ reduces to

$$\llbracket M \rrbracket \triangleleft_{\tau} M$$

for all $M \in \text{PCF}_{\tau}$.

↓ Take $z = \text{hat or wool}$
Adequacy

Fundamental property of the relations \triangleleft_{τ}

Proposition. *If $\Gamma \vdash M : \tau$ is a valid PCF typing, then for all Γ -environments ρ and all Γ -substitutions σ*

$$\rho \triangleleft_{\Gamma} \sigma \Rightarrow \llbracket \Gamma \vdash M \rrbracket(\rho) \triangleleft_{\tau} M[\sigma]$$

-
- $\rho \triangleleft_{\Gamma} \sigma$ means that $\rho(x) \triangleleft_{\Gamma(x)} \sigma(x)$ holds for each $x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$.
 - $M[\sigma]$ is the PCF term resulting from the simultaneous substitution of $\sigma(x)$ for x in M , each $x \in \text{dom}(\Gamma)$.

Contextual preorder between PCF terms

Given PCF terms M_1, M_2 , PCF type τ , and a type environment Γ , the relation $\Gamma \vdash M_1 \leq_{\text{ctx}} M_2 : \tau$ is defined to hold iff

- Both the typings $\Gamma \vdash M_1 : \tau$ and $\Gamma \vdash M_2 : \tau$ hold.
- For all PCF contexts \mathcal{C} for which $\mathcal{C}[M_1]$ and $\mathcal{C}[M_2]$ are closed terms of type γ , where $\gamma = \text{nat}$ or $\gamma = \text{bool}$, and for all values $V \in \text{PCF}_\gamma$,

$$\mathcal{C}[M_1] \Downarrow_\gamma V \implies \mathcal{C}[M_2] \Downarrow_\gamma V .$$

In fact: $M_1 \leq_{\text{ctx}} M_2 \iff \llbracket M_1 \rrbracket \triangleleft M_2$

$M_1, M_2 : \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \tau_n \rightarrow \gamma$

Extensionality properties of \leq_{ctx}

$M_1 \leq_{\text{ctx}} M_2 \iff \forall N_1, N_2, \dots, N_n. M_1 N_1 N_2 \dots N_n \Downarrow \checkmark$

At a ground type $\gamma \in \{\text{bool}, \text{nat}\}$, $\implies M_2 N_1 N_2 \dots N_n \Downarrow \checkmark$

$M_1 \leq_{\text{ctx}} M_2 : \gamma$ holds if and only if

$$\forall V \in \text{PCF}_\gamma (M_1 \Downarrow_\gamma V \implies M_2 \Downarrow_\gamma V) .$$

At a function type $\tau \rightarrow \tau'$,

$M_1 \leq_{\text{ctx}} M_2 : \tau \rightarrow \tau'$ holds if and only if

$$\forall M \in \text{PCF}_\tau (M_1 M \leq_{\text{ctx}} M_2 M : \tau') .$$

Applicative contexts: $[-] N_1 \dots N_n$