

Author: Franck van Breugel
Title: Topological Models in Comparative Semantics
Language of presentation: English
Promotor: Prof. dr. Jaco de Bakker
Date of defense: September 28, 1994
Institution granting degree: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Abstract:

During the last three decades several different styles of *semantics* for programming languages have been developed. This thesis *compares* two of them: the *operational* and the *denotational* approach. We show how to give operational and denotational semantics to programming languages, and how to compare different semantic models for a given language. Both in the definition of the denotational semantics and in the comparison of semantic models we make use of *metric topology*. This thesis builds on the pioneering work by Arnold and Nivat and the foundational work by the Amsterdam Concurrency Group headed by De Bakker on the use of metric spaces in semantics.

The work reported in this thesis started with the search for *comparative semantics* for a fragment of *ACPrp*, a real time language introduced by Baeten and Bergstra (1991). The principal construction of this language is the *integration* statement. In its most general form the integration statement gives rise to *unbounded nondeterminism*. We first considered a *finite* version of integration. An *operational semantics* was given for the language by means of a *labelled transition system*. Furthermore, a *denotational semantics* based on a *complete metric space* was constructed for the language. We proved that the two semantic models are equivalent by means of standard tools. Inspired by a theorem of Michael (1951), a result from general topology which roughly tells us that a compact union of compact sets is again compact, we next considered the language with a *compact* version of integration. The operational semantics could be extended without any problems. For the extension of the denotational semantics we needed some new ingredients. In the definition of the denotational semantics we exploited the already mentioned theorem of Michael and the fact that a continuous image of a compact set is compact, a result from general topology due to Alexandroff (1927). The equivalence proof of the two semantic models was the most difficult part to generalize. To prove the equivalence by *uniqueness of fixed point*, a proof principle based on Banach's unique fixed point theorem (1922) and introduced in semantics by Kok and Rutten (1990), the operational semantics should be *compact*. The compactness of an operational semantics is usually derived from the fact that the labelled transition system inducing the semantics satisfies the finiteness condition *finitely branching*. However, the labelled transition system at hand is not finitely branching. It does not even satisfy the weaker finiteness condition *image finite*. We provided the labelled transition system with some additional metric structure. The enriched labelled transition system was shown to be *compactly branching*, a generalization of finitely branching. This generalization enabled us to prove that the operational semantics is compact. The operational and denotational semantics and their equivalence proof are presented in Chapter 8.

In the above described comparative semantic study we used labelled transition systems enriched with metrics. We call these enriched labelled transition systems *metric labelled transition systems*. We continued our research by developing a general theory for metric labelled transition systems. Several unsuccessful attempts were made to generalize the other finiteness condition *image finite*. Restricting our attention to functions being nonexpansive, rather than continuous, enabled us to generalize image finite to *image compact*. We proved that an image compact metric labelled transition system induces a *closed* operational semantics, generalizing the folklore result that an image finite labelled transition system gives rise to a closed operational semantics. The theory of

metric labelled transition systems is presented in Chapter 7. This theory generalizes well known results of labelled transition systems. These results are presented in Chapter 4 and applied to give comparative semantics to a very simple language in Chapter 5.

Apart from the comparative semantic study described above we applied the theory of metric labelled transition systems to give comparative semantics to several other languages. Two further applications are presented in this thesis. An operational semantics and a denotational semantics for a language with *iteration* are related by uniqueness of fixed point in Chapter 9. A language with *second order communication* is modelled operationally and denotationally and the relationship of the two semantic models is studied in Chapter 10 (joint work with De Bakker).

In the study of metric labelled transition systems we encountered a new *branching domain*: a complete metric space of labelled trees. The elements of the branching domain, the *branching processes*, are endowed with a metric such that the distance of branching processes increases (exponentially) if the maximal depth at which the truncations of the branching processes coincide decreases (linearly). The branching domain was designed to model *image finite* language constructions, those constructions modelled operationally by means of an image finite labelled transition system. The *random assignment* is a standard example of an image finite language construction. The branching domain is used to give comparative semantics to a language with random assignment in Chapter 6. We were interested to see how this new branching domain relates to two already known branching domains introduced by De Bakker and Zucker (1982, 1983). The one domain was also introduced to model image finite language constructions, whereas the other domain was designed to model *finitely branching* constructions. The new domain turned out to be situated properly in between the two other domains. Although the new domain was designed to fit in between them, it took us some time before we could actually prove this. In the proof we employed various results from general topology including a theorem of Lindenbaum (1926), which had not been used before in semantics as far as we know. In the comparison of the branching domains we also used the fact that the branching domains are *compact* metric spaces. The study of the branching domains is presented in Chapter 3.

When the research reported in this thesis was started some problems of the branching domain for image finite constructions were already known. Bergstra and Klop (1987) had shown that the obvious *parallel composition* of two branching processes is in general not a branching process. Warmerdam (1990) had provided an intricate example showing that the same holds for the *sequential composition*. The new branching domain does not give rise to these problems. The sequential composition on the old and the new branching domain for image finite constructions is discussed in Section 6.3.

In the comparative study of the branching domains we exploited the fact that the branching domains are *compact* metric spaces. A rather ad hoc proof of this fact was first provided. In notes by Warmerdam (1991) we found some general theory, based on the theory of solving domain equations over *complete* metric spaces developed by America and Rutten (1989), also proving this fact. We worked out the details (joint work with Warmerdam). The main results can be found in Chapter 2.

Table of contents:

Introduction	1
1 Mathematical preliminaries	9
1.1 Set theory	9
1.2 Topology	10

1.2.1	Topological and metric spaces	10
1.2.2	Isometry	12
1.2.3	1-Boundedness	13
1.2.4	Functions	13
1.2.5	Closedness	14
1.2.6	Completeness	15
1.2.7	Compactness	16
1.2.8	Spaces of subsets	17
1.2.9	Discrete spaces	19
1.2.10	Ultrametric spaces	19
1.2.11	Weight	20
1.2.12	Lifting	20
1.2.13	A unique fixed point theorem	21
1.3	Category theory	21
1.4	Bibliographic notes	27
2	Solving domain equations	29
2.1	From operations to functors	30
2.2	Fixed points of functors	32
2.3	The nonexpansive function space	34
2.4	Lipschitz coefficients	36
2.5	Fixed points as completions	39
2.6	Bibliographic notes	41
3	Linear and branching domains	43
3.1	Two linear domains	43
3.2	Comparison of the linear domains	46
3.3	Four branching domains	47
3.4	Comparison of the branching domains	56
3.4.1	Compact space	57
3.4.2	Discrete and infinite space	57
3.4.3	Discrete and finite space	61
3.4.4	Discrete space	69
3.5	Relating linear and branching domains	72
3.6	Bibliographic notes	76
4	Operational semantics	79
4.1	Labelled transition systems	80
4.2	Operational semantics	82
4.3	Linear higher order transformations	87
4.3.1	Compactness preserving linear higher order transformations	89
4.3.2	Closedness preserving linear higher order transformations	91
4.4	Branching higher order transformations	93
4.4.1	Compactness preserving branching higher order transformations	93
4.4.2	Closedness preserving branching higher order transformations	96
4.5	Relating higher order transformations	98
4.6	Bibliographic notes	101

5	μ-Recursion	103
5.1	Language definition	103
5.2	Operational semantics	105
5.3	Denotational semantics	111
5.4	Equivalence theorem	116
5.5	Bibliographic notes	118
6	Random assignment	119
6.1	Language definition	119
6.2	Operational semantics	120
6.3	Denotational semantics	125
6.4	Relating \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{D}	131
6.5	Bibliographic notes	133
7	Generalized finiteness conditions	135
7.1	Metric labelled transition systems	135
7.2	Operational semantics	140
7.3	Linear higher order transformations	153
7.3.1	Compactness preserving linear higher order transformations	154
7.3.2	Closedness preserving linear higher order transformations	156
7.4	Branching higher order transformations	158
7.4.1	Compactness preserving branching higher order transformations	158
7.4.2	Closedness preserving branching higher order transformations	160
7.5	Relating higher order transformations	162
7.6	Bibliographic notes	169
8	Real time integration	171
8.1	Language definition	171
8.2	Operational semantics	173
8.3	Denotational semantics	180
8.4	Equivalence theorem	183
8.5	Bibliographic notes	185
9	Iteration	187
9.1	Language definition	187
9.2	Operational semantics	187
9.3	Denotational semantics	194
9.4	Relating \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{D}	198
9.5	Alternative denotational semantics	199
9.6	Bibliographic notes	202
10	Second order communication	203
10.1	Language definition	203
10.2	Operational semantics	203
10.3	Denotational semantics	209
10.4	Relating \mathcal{O} and \mathcal{D}	213
10.5	Bibliographic notes	223

Bibliography	225
List of symbols	239
Author index	241
Subject index	243

Author's correspondence address:

Franck van Breugel
McGill University
School of Computer Science
3480 University Street
Montreal H3A 2A7
Canada
franck@cs.mcgill.ca