

- Prepare your solutions on paper.
- Marking an exercise in OLAT means that a significant part of that exercise has been treated.
- Upload your solution in OLAT as a single PDF file.
- **This is a bonus exercise sheet.**

**Exercise 1**     *Repetition: Proofs by Induction on Terms***9 p.**

Recall that  $\mathcal{V}$  denotes a typed set of variables. Let  $\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}'$  be two typed sets of variables.

The merge of two sets of variables is defined as  $\mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{V}'$ , and implicitly assumes that there are no conflicting variable assignments. For instance  $\{x : \text{Nat}, y : \text{List}\} \cup \{x : \text{Nat}, z : \text{Nat}\}$  is possible and results in  $\{x : \text{Nat}, y : \text{List}, z : \text{Nat}\}$ , but  $\{x : \text{Nat}, y : \text{List}\} \cup \{x : \text{List}, z : \text{Nat}\}$  is not allowed.

1. Show that the set of typed terms is monotone:  $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma, \mathcal{V})_\tau \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\Sigma, \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{V}')_\tau$ . (3 points)
2. Show soundness of the type inference algorithm, cf. slide 4/8–9: if  $\text{infer\_type } \Sigma \ \tau \ t = \text{return } \mathcal{V}$  then
  - $\mathcal{V}$  is well-defined (no conflicting variable assignments) and
  - $t \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma, \mathcal{V})_\tau$

(6 points)

**Exercise 2**     *Semantics of Imperative Programs***6 p.**

Prove the other direction of the equivalence of big-step semantics (see exercise sheet 12) and small-step semantics:

$$(C, \alpha) \leftrightarrow^* (\text{skip}, \beta) \longrightarrow (C, \alpha) \rightarrow \beta$$

Clearly state which kind of induction you are using.

Hint: In the proof you will most likely figure out one required auxiliary property of  $\leftrightarrow$  that you should clearly state as lemma, but don't need to prove.

**Exercise 3**     *Soundness of Hoare-Calculus***5 p.**

In the lecture we only considered partial correctness of the Hoare-calculus, i.e., we proved:

$$\vdash (\varphi) P (\psi) \longrightarrow \models (\varphi) P (\psi)$$

In this exercise we consider total correctness.

1. Provide a definition of  $\models_{\text{total}} (\varphi) P (\psi)$ , i.e., a semantic notion of total correctness. You can exploit that  $\leftrightarrow$  is deterministic, i.e., for all  $a$  there is at most one  $b$  such that  $a \leftrightarrow b$ . (2 points)
2. How would you try to prove  $\vdash (\varphi) P (\psi) \longrightarrow \models_{\text{total}} (\varphi) P (\psi)$  for the Hoare-calculus with while-total rule? Just state the main property you would try to prove, and state which proof principle (induction, proof by contradiction, etc.) you would apply, with a brief justification why this looks like a promising attempt. (3 points)