

Stateful Structural Operational Semantics

*Sergey Goncharov, Stefan Milius, Lutz
Schröder, Stelios Tsampas, Henning Urbat*

GSOS Laws (Turi-Plotkin Semantics)

Let endofunctors Σ and B , modelling syntax and behavior



GSOS laws are nat. transformations $\rho_X : \Sigma(X \times BX) \Rightarrow B\Sigma^* X$



More generally, any distributive law of a monad T over a comonad S , although these tend to be (co)freely generated

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 S & \xlongequal{\quad} & S \\
 \eta \downarrow & & \downarrow S(\eta) \\
 TS & \xrightarrow{\quad \rho \quad} & ST \\
 T(\varepsilon) \downarrow & & \downarrow \varepsilon \\
 T & \xlongequal{\quad} & T
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 T^2 S & \xrightarrow{T(\rho)} & TST & \xrightarrow{\rho} & ST^2 \\
 \mu \downarrow & & & & \downarrow S(\mu) \\
 TS & \xrightarrow{\quad \rho \quad} & ST & & \\
 T(\delta) \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \delta \\
 TS^2 & \xrightarrow{\rho} & STS & \xrightarrow{S(\rho)} & S^2 T
 \end{array}$$

Bialgebras

Any and all transitions of a composite term are determined by the transitions of its subterms

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \boxed{\Sigma\text{-algebra}} & & \boxed{\text{B-coalgebra}} \\ & & \text{g} & & \text{h} \\ \Sigma X & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & BX \\ & & & & \uparrow Bg^\# \\ & & & & \uparrow \\ \Sigma(X \times BX) & \xrightarrow{\rho} & & & B\Sigma^* X \\ & & & & \downarrow \Sigma\langle 1, h \rangle \\ & & & & \downarrow \end{array}$$

Bialgebras



There is the category ρ -**bialg** of ρ -bialgebras:

- Objects of ρ -**bialg** are ρ -bialgebras
- Morphisms are maps that are both algebra and coalgebra homomorphisms at the same time



The initial Σ -algebra (A, α) extends to the initial ρ -bialgebra



The final B -coalgebra (Z, z) extends to the final ρ -bialgebra

Corollary. *There is a unique bialgebra map $beh : A \rightarrow Z$, mapping terms to their behaviors. Hence, **bisimilarity is a congruence***.*

An example

$$\frac{P \xrightarrow{\delta} P'}{P + Q \xrightarrow{\delta} P'} \qquad \frac{Q \xrightarrow{\delta} Q'}{P + Q \xrightarrow{\delta} Q'}$$

$$BX = \mathcal{P}_f(\Delta_\tau \times X), \Sigma X = X \times X$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho : \Sigma(\text{Id} \times B) &\Longrightarrow B\Sigma^* \\ (x, X) + (y, Y) &\mapsto X \cup Y \end{aligned}$$

A *While* language

$$\text{skip} \frac{}{s, \text{skip} \downarrow s}$$

$$\text{asn} \frac{}{s, (x := e) \downarrow s[x \leftarrow [e]_s]}$$

$$\text{while1} \frac{[e]_s = 0}{s, \text{while } e \text{ } p \downarrow s}$$

$$\text{while2} \frac{[e]_s \neq 0 \quad q = \text{while } e \text{ } p}{s, q \rightarrow s, (p; q)}$$

$$\text{seq1} \frac{s, p \downarrow s'}{s, (p; q) \rightarrow s', q}$$

$$\text{seq2} \frac{s, p \rightarrow s', p'}{s, (p; q) \rightarrow s', (p'; q)}$$

Imperative languages

- Originally, Turi considered functor $(S \times (X + 1))^S$ to model the behavior of imperative languages
- For instance, sequential composition had a component of the type $S \times (X \times (S \times (X + 1))^S)^2 \rightarrow S \times (\Sigma^* X + 1)$

$$s, (x, f), (y, g) \mapsto \begin{cases} (s', (x' ; y)) & \text{if } f(s) = (s', x') \\ (s', y) & \text{if } f(s) = (s', \checkmark). \end{cases}$$

Imperative languages

- Originally, Turi considered functor $(S \times (X + 1))^S$ to model the behavior of imperative languages
- For instance, sequential composition is a component of the type $S \times (X + 1)^S$, $(\Sigma^* X + 1)^S$

$$f(s, (x, f), (y, g)) = \begin{cases} (s', x'; y) & \text{if } f(s) = (s', x') \\ (s', y) & \text{if } f(s) = (s', \checkmark). \end{cases}$$

OVERKILL

Imperative languages

- A behavior of $(S \times (X + 1))^S$ implies contexts are far more capable than what they really are. For a comparison:

$$\text{seq1} \frac{s, p \downarrow s'}{s, (p; q) \rightarrow s', q}$$

$$\text{seq2} \frac{s, p \rightarrow s', p'}{s, (p; q) \rightarrow s', (p'; q)}$$

$$\text{ob} \frac{s_1, p \rightarrow s'_1, p'_1 \quad s_2, p \rightarrow s'_2, p'_2 \quad s_3, p \rightarrow s'_3, p'_3}{s, [p] \rightarrow s_4, p'_3}$$

Something simpler

$$\text{seq1} \frac{s, p \downarrow s'}{s, (p; q) \rightarrow s', q}$$

$$\text{seq2} \frac{s, p \rightarrow s', p'}{s, (p; q) \rightarrow s', (p'; q)}$$

$$S \times (X \times S \times (X + 1))^2 \rightarrow (S \times \Sigma^* X + 1)$$

$$(s, (x, s', *), (y, _, _)) \mapsto (s', y)$$

$$(s, (x, s', x'), (y, _, _)) \mapsto (s', (x'; y))$$

Definition 3.7. A *stateful SOS law* is a natural transformation

$$\delta_X : S \times \Sigma(X \times S \times (X + 1)) \rightarrow S \times (\Sigma^* X + 1) \quad (X \in \mathbf{Set}).$$

Stateful SOS laws are in a bijective correspondence with *stateful SOS specifications*, i.e. systems whose rules look like (for $W \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$)

$$\frac{(s, x_j \rightarrow s'_j, y_j)_{j \in W} \quad (s, x_j \downarrow s'_j)_{j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus W}}{s, f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow s', t}$$

Compositionality in imperative languages

- Thing is, one can still have wonky, “concurrency” rules like

$$\frac{s, p \rightarrow s', p'}{s, p \triangleleft q \rightarrow s', q \triangleleft p'} \qquad \frac{s, p \downarrow s'}{s, p \triangleleft q \rightarrow s', q}$$

- Let $BX = S \times (X + 1)$ and $TX = (BX)^S$
- Stateful SOS specification exhibit compositionality in domain \mathbf{vT} (the final coalgebra of T), which is typically too fine-grained

Compositionality in imperative languages

- Let $BX = S \times (X + 1)$ and $TX = (BX)^S$
- Standard choices for semantic domain are *trace semantics* $(\nu B)^S$ and *termination semantics* $(S + 1)^S$
- When is trace semantics compositional?
- When is termination semantics compositional?
- These questions are outright undecidable and compositionality is challenging to prove in a per-case basis



*How about restricting the rule
format for compositionality?*

Streamlined stateful SOS

- Compositional trace semantics $(\nu B)^S$
- Receiving rules have to be as follows

$$\frac{s, x_j \rightarrow s', y_j}{s, f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow s', t} \quad \text{where } t = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)[y_j/x_j] \text{ or } t = y_j;$$

Streamlined stateful SOS

- Compositional trace semantics $(\nu B)^S$
- Receiving rules have to be as follows

$$\frac{s, x_j \rightarrow s', y_j}{s, f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow s', t} \quad \text{where } t = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)[y_j/x_j] \text{ or } t = y_j;$$

$$\frac{s, p \rightarrow s', p'}{s, p \triangleleft q \rightarrow s', q \triangleleft p'}$$

$$\frac{s, p \downarrow s'}{s, p \triangleleft q \rightarrow s', q}$$

Streamlined stateful SOS

- Compositional trace semantics $(\nu B)^S$
- Receiving rules have to be as follows

$$\frac{s, x_j \rightarrow s', y_j}{s, f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow s', t} \quad \text{where } t = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)[y_j/x_j] \text{ or } t = y_j;$$

NOPE

$$\frac{s, p \rightarrow s', p'}{s, p \triangleleft q \rightarrow s', q \triangleleft p'}$$

$$\frac{s, p \downarrow s'}{s, p \triangleleft q \rightarrow s', q}$$

Streamlined stateful SOS

- Compositional trace semantics $(\nu B)^S$
- Receiving rules have to be as follows

$$\frac{s, x_j \rightarrow s', y_j}{s, f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow s', t} \quad \text{where } t = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)[y_j/x_j] \text{ or } t = y_j;$$

$$\frac{s, p \rightarrow s', p' \quad [\mathbf{i}]_s \neq 0 \quad \neg P(s')}{s, (p; q) \rightarrow s', (p'; q)}$$

Streamlined stateful SOS

- Compositional trace semantics $(\nu B)^S$
- Receiving rules have to be as follows

$$\frac{s, x_j \rightarrow s', y_j}{s, f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow s', t} \quad \text{where } t = f(x_1, \dots, x_n)[y_j/x_j] \text{ or } t = y_j;$$



$$\frac{s, p \rightarrow s', p' \quad [\mathbf{i}]_s \neq 0 \quad \neg P(s')}{s, (p; q) \rightarrow s', (p'; q)}$$

Cool stateful SOS

- Compositional termination semantics $(S + 1)^S$
- All rules with a progressing premiss have to be as follows

$$\frac{s, x_j \rightarrow s', y_j}{s, f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow s', f(x_1, \dots, x_n)[y_j/x_j]}$$

Cool stateful SOS

- Compositional termination semantics $(S + 1)^S$
- All rules with a progressing premiss have to be as follows

$$\frac{s, x_j \rightarrow s', y_j}{s, f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow s', f(x_1, \dots, x_n)[y_j/x_j]}$$

$$\frac{s, p \rightarrow s', p'}{s, p \triangleleft q \rightarrow s', q \triangleleft p'}$$

$$\frac{s, p \downarrow s'}{s, p \triangleleft q \rightarrow s', q}$$

Cool stateful SOS

- Compositional termination semantics $(S + 1)^S$
- All rules with a progressing premiss have to be as follows

$$\frac{s, x_j \rightarrow s', y_j}{s, f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow s', f(x_1, \dots, x_n)[y_j/x_j]}$$

NOPE

$$\frac{s, p \rightarrow s', p'}{s, p \triangleleft q \rightarrow s', q \triangleleft p'}$$

$$\frac{s, p \downarrow s'}{s, p \triangleleft q \rightarrow s', q}$$

Cool stateful SOS

- Compositional termination semantics $(S + 1)^S$
- All rules with a progressing premiss have to be as follows

$$\frac{s, x_j \rightarrow s', y_j}{s, f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow s', f(x_1, \dots, x_n)[y_j/x_j]}$$

$$\frac{s, p \rightarrow s', p' \quad [i]_s \neq 0 \quad P(s')}{s, (p; q) \rightarrow s', q}$$

Cool stateful SOS

- Compositional termination semantics $(S + 1)^S$
- All rules with a progressing premiss have to be as follows

$$\frac{s, x_j \rightarrow s', y_j}{s, f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \rightarrow s', f(x_1, \dots, x_n)[y_j/x_j]}$$

NOPE

$$\frac{s, p \rightarrow s', p' \quad [i]_s \neq 0 \quad P(s')}{s, (p; q) \rightarrow s', q}$$

Thank you

Full paper at <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2202.10866.pdf>