

Conditional Branch Macro Instructions of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}}$. Part I

Noriko Asamoto
Ochanomizu University
Tokyo

MML Identifier: $\mathbf{SCMFSAS8A}$.

The terminology and notation used in this paper are introduced in the following papers: [16], [22], [6], [10], [23], [11], [12], [9], [5], [7], [13], [19], [15], [21], [17], [18], [2], [8], [20], [14], [4], [3], and [1].

One can prove the following propositions:

- (1) For all functions f, g such that $\text{dom } f$ misses $\text{dom } g$ holds $f + \cdot g = g + \cdot f$.
- (2) For all functions f, g and for every set D such that $\text{dom } g$ misses D holds $(f + \cdot g) \upharpoonright D = f \upharpoonright D$.
- (3) For every state s of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}}$ holds $\text{dom}(s \upharpoonright (\text{the instruction locations of } \mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}})) = \text{the instruction locations of } \mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}}$.
- (4) For every state s of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}}$ such that s is halting and for every natural number k such that $\text{LifeSpan}(s) \leq k$ holds $\text{CurInstr}(\text{Computation}(s))(k) = \mathbf{halt}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}}}$.
- (5) For every state s of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}}$ such that s is halting and for every natural number k such that $\text{LifeSpan}(s) \leq k$ holds $\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s))(k)} = \mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s))(\text{LifeSpan}(s))}$.
- (6) Let s_1, s_2 be states of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}}$. Then s_1 and s_2 are equal outside the instruction locations of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}}$ if and only if $\mathbf{IC}_{(s_1)} = \mathbf{IC}_{(s_2)}$ and $s_1 \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations}) = s_2 \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations})$.
- (7) For every state s of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}}$ and for every macro instruction I holds $\mathbf{IC}_{\mathbf{IExec}(I,s)} = \mathbf{IC}_{\mathbf{Result}(s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I))}$.
- (8) For every state s of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}}$ and for every macro instruction I holds $\text{Initialize}(s) + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I) = s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I)$.
- (9) For every macro instruction I and for every instruction-location l of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}}$ holds $I \subseteq I + \cdot \text{Start-At}(l)$.

- (10) For every state s of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and for every instruction-location l of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ holds $s \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations}) = (s + \cdot \text{Start-At}(l)) \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations})$.
- (11) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$, and let I be a macro instruction, and let l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Then $s \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations}) = (s + \cdot (I + \cdot \text{Start-At}(l))) \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations})$.
- (12) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Then $\text{dom}(s \upharpoonright (\text{the instruction locations of } \mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}))$ misses $\text{dom Start-At}(l)$.
- (13) For every state s of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and for every macro instruction I holds $s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I) = \text{Initialize}(s) + \cdot (I + \cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))$.
- (14) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$, and let I_1, I_2 be macro instructions, and let l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Then $s + \cdot (I_1 + \cdot \text{Start-At}(l))$ and $s + \cdot (I_2 + \cdot \text{Start-At}(l))$ are equal outside the instruction locations of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$.
- (15) $\text{dom}(\text{Stop}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}) = \{\text{insloc}(0)\}$.
- (16) $\text{insloc}(0) \in \text{dom}(\text{Stop}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}})$ and $\text{Stop}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}(\text{insloc}(0)) = \mathbf{halt}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$.
- (17) $\text{card}(\text{Stop}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}) = 1$.

Let P be a programmed finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. The functor $\text{Directed}(P, l)$ yields a programmed finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and is defined as follows:

(Def. 1) $\text{Directed}(P, l) = (\text{id}_{(\text{the instructions of } \mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}})} + \cdot (\mathbf{halt}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}} \mapsto \text{goto } l)) \cdot P$.

One can prove the following proposition

- (18) For every programmed finite partial state I of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ holds $\text{Directed}(I) = \text{Directed}(I, \text{insloc}(\text{card } I))$.

Let P be a programmed finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. One can check that $\text{Directed}(P, l)$ is halt-free.

Let P be a programmed finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Note that $\text{Directed}(P)$ is halt-free.

Next we state several propositions:

- (19) For every programmed finite partial state P of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and for every instruction-location l of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ holds $\text{dom } \text{Directed}(P, l) = \text{dom } P$.
- (20) Let P be a programmed finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Then $\text{Directed}(P, l) = P + \cdot (\mathbf{halt}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}} \mapsto \text{goto } l) \cdot P$.
- (21) Let P be a programmed finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$, and let l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$, and let x be arbitrary. Suppose $x \in \text{dom } P$. Then if $P(x) = \mathbf{halt}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$, then $(\text{Directed}(P, l))(x) = \text{goto } l$ and if $P(x) \neq \mathbf{halt}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$, then $(\text{Directed}(P, l))(x) = P(x)$.

- (22) Let i be an instruction of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$, and let a be an integer location, and let n be a natural number. If i does not destroy a , then $\text{IncAddr}(i, n)$ does not destroy a .
- (23) Let P be a programmed finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$, and let n be a natural number, and let a be an integer location. If P does not destroy a , then $\text{ProgramPart}(\text{Relocated}(P, n))$ does not destroy a .
- (24) For every good programmed finite partial state P of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and for every natural number n holds $\text{ProgramPart}(\text{Relocated}(P, n))$ is good.
- (25) Let I, J be programmed finite partial states of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let a be an integer location. Suppose I does not destroy a and J does not destroy a . Then $I+\cdot J$ does not destroy a .
- (26) For all good programmed finite partial states I, J of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ holds $I+\cdot J$ is good.
- (27) Let I be a programmed finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$, and let l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$, and let a be an integer location. If I does not destroy a , then $\text{Directed}(I, l)$ does not destroy a .

Let I be a good programmed finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Note that $\text{Directed}(I, l)$ is good.

Let I be a good macro instruction. Note that $\text{Directed}(I)$ is good.

Let I be a macro instruction and let l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. One can verify that $\text{Directed}(I, l)$ is initial.

Let I, J be good macro instructions. Observe that $I;J$ is good.

Let l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. The functor $\text{Goto}(l)$ yields a halt-free good macro instruction and is defined by:

(Def. 2) $\text{Goto}(l) = \text{insloc}(0) \mapsto \text{goto } l$.

Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let I be a finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$.

We say that I is psuedo-closed on s if and only if the condition (Def. 3) is satisfied.

(Def. 3) There exists a natural number k such that

$\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+\cdot(I+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(k)} = \text{insloc}(\text{card } I)$ and for every natural number n such that $n < k$ holds

$\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+\cdot(I+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(n)} \in \text{dom } I$.

Let I be a finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. We say that I is psuedo-paraclosed if and only if:

(Def. 4) For every state s of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ holds I is psuedo-closed on s .

Let us observe that there exists a macro instruction which is psuedo-paraclosed.

Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let I be a macro instruction. Let us assume that I is psuedo-closed on s . The functor $\text{psuedo-LifeSpan}(s, I)$ yielding a natural number is defined by:

(Def. 5) $\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+\cdot(I+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(\text{psuedo-LifeSpan}(s, I))} = \text{insloc}(\text{card } I)$ and for every natural number n such that

$\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+\cdot(I+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(n)} \notin \text{dom } I$ holds $\text{psuedo-LifeSpan}(s, I) \leq n$.

We now state a number of propositions:

- (28) For all macro instructions I, J and for arbitrary x such that $x \in \text{dom } I$ holds $(I;J)(x) = (\text{Directed}(I))(x)$.
- (29) For every instruction-location l of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ holds $\text{card Goto}(l) = 1$.
- (30) Let P be a programmed finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let x be arbitrary. Suppose $x \in \text{dom } P$. Then if $P(x) = \mathbf{halt}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$, then $(\text{Directed}(P))(x) = \text{goto insloc}(\text{card } P)$ and if $P(x) \neq \mathbf{halt}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$, then $(\text{Directed}(P))(x) = P(x)$.
- (31) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let I be a macro instruction. Suppose I is psuedo-closed on s . Let n be a natural number. If $n < \text{psuedo} - \text{LifeSpan}(s, I)$, then $\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+\cdot(I+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(n)} \in \text{dom } I$ and $\text{CurInstr}((\text{Computation}(s+\cdot(I+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(n)) \neq \mathbf{halt}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$.
- (32) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let I, J be macro instructions. Suppose I is psuedo-closed on s . Let k be a natural number. Suppose $k \leq \text{psuedo} - \text{LifeSpan}(s, I)$. Then $(\text{Computation}(s+\cdot(I+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(k)$ and $(\text{Computation}(s+\cdot((I;J)+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(k)$ are equal outside the instruction locations of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$.
- (33) For every programmed finite partial state I of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and for every instruction-location l of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ holds $\text{card Directed}(I, l) = \text{card } I$.
- (34) For every macro instruction I holds $\text{card Directed}(I) = \text{card } I$.
- (35) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let I be a macro instruction. Suppose I is closed on s and halting on s . Let k be a natural number. Suppose $k \leq \text{LifeSpan}(s+\cdot(I+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0))))$. Then $(\text{Computation}(s+\cdot(I+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(k)$ and $(\text{Computation}(s+\cdot(\text{Directed}(I)+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(k)$ are equal outside the instruction locations of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and $\text{CurInstr}((\text{Computation}(s+\cdot(\text{Directed}(I)+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(k)) \neq \mathbf{halt}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$.
- (36) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let I be a macro instruction. Suppose I is closed on s and halting on s .
Then $\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+\cdot(\text{Directed}(I)+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+\cdot(I+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0))))+1)} = \text{insloc}(\text{card } I)$ and $(\text{Computation}(s+\cdot(I+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+\cdot(I+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))) \uparrow (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations})) = (\text{Computation}(s+\cdot(\text{Directed}(I)+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+\cdot(I+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))) + 1) \uparrow (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations})$.
- (37) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let I be a macro instruction. If I is closed on s and halting on s , then $\text{Directed}(I)$ is psuedo-closed on s .
- (38) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let I be a macro instruction. If I is closed on s and halting on s , then $\text{psuedo} - \text{LifeSpan}(s, \text{Directed}(I)) = \text{LifeSpan}(s+\cdot(I+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))) + 1$.

- (39) Let I be a programmed finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. If I is halt-free, then $\text{Directed}(I, l) = I$.
- (40) For every macro instruction I such that I is halt-free holds $\text{Directed}(I) = I$.
- (41) For all macro instructions I, J holds $\text{Directed}(I); J = I; J$.
- (42) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let I, J be macro instructions. Suppose I is closed on s and halting on s . Then
- (i) for every natural number k such that $k \leq \text{LifeSpan}(s+. (I+. \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0))))$ holds $\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+. (\text{Directed}(I)+. \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0))))(k))} = \mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+. ((I;J)+. \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0))))(k))}$ and $\text{CurInstr}((\text{Computation}(s+. (\text{Directed}(I)+. \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0))))(k))) = \text{CurInstr}((\text{Computation}(s+. ((I;J)+. \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0))))(k)))$,
 - (ii) $(\text{Computation}(s+. (\text{Directed}(I)+. \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+. (I+. \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))) + 1) \uparrow (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations}) = (\text{Computation}(s+. ((I;J)+. \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+. (I+. \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))) + 1) \uparrow (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations})$, and
 - (iii) $\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+. (\text{Directed}(I)+. \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+. (I+. \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0))))+1)} = \mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+. ((I;J)+. \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+. (I+. \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0))))+1)}$.
- (43) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let I, J be macro instructions. Suppose I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$. Then
- (i) for every natural number k such that $k \leq \text{LifeSpan}(s+. \text{Initialized}(I))$ holds $\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+. \text{Initialized}(\text{Directed}(I))))(k)} = \mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+. \text{Initialized}(I;J)))(k)}$ and $\text{CurInstr}((\text{Computation}(s+. \text{Initialized}(\text{Directed}(I))))(k)) = \text{CurInstr}((\text{Computation}(s+. \text{Initialized}(I;J)))(k))$,
 - (ii) $(\text{Computation}(s+. \text{Initialized}(\text{Directed}(I))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+. \text{Initialized}(I))+1) \uparrow (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations}) = (\text{Computation}(s+. \text{Initialized}(I;J)))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+. \text{Initialized}(I))+1) \uparrow (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations})$, and
 - (iii) $\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+. \text{Initialized}(\text{Directed}(I))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+. \text{Initialized}(I))+1)} = \mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+. \text{Initialized}(I;J)))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+. \text{Initialized}(I))+1)}$.
- (44) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let I be a macro instruction. Suppose I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$. Let k be a natural number. Suppose $k \leq \text{LifeSpan}(s+. \text{Initialized}(I))$. Then $(\text{Computation}(s+. \text{Initialized}(I)))(k)$ and $(\text{Computation}(s+. \text{Initialized}(\text{Directed}(I))))(k)$ are equal outside the instruction locations of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and $\text{CurInstr}((\text{Computation}(s+. \text{Initialized}(\text{Directed}(I))))(k)) \neq \mathbf{halts}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$.
- (45) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let I be a macro instruction. Suppose I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$. Then $\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+. \text{Initialized}(\text{Directed}(I))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+. \text{Initialized}(I))+1)} = \text{insloc}(\text{card } I)$ and $(\text{Computation}(s+. \text{Initialized}(I)))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+. \text{Initialized}(I))) \uparrow (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations}) = (\text{Computation}(s+. \text{Initialized}(\text{Directed}(I))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+. \text{Initialized}(I))+1) \uparrow (\text{Int-Locations}$

- $\cup \text{FinSeq-Locations}$).
- (46) Let I be a macro instruction and let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Suppose I is closed on s and halting on s . Then $I; \text{Stop}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$ is closed on s and $I; \text{Stop}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$ is halting on s .
 - (47) For every instruction-location l of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ holds $\text{insloc}(0) \in \text{dom Goto}(l)$ and $(\text{Goto}(l))(\text{insloc}(0)) = \text{goto } l$.
 - (48) Let I be a programmed finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let x be arbitrary. If $x \in \text{dom } I$, then $I(x)$ is an instruction of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$.
 - (49) Let I be a programmed finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$, and let x be arbitrary, and let k be a natural number. If $x \in \text{dom ProgramPart}(\text{Relocated}(I, k))$, then $(\text{ProgramPart}(\text{Relocated}(I, k)))(x) = (\text{Relocated}(I, k))(x)$.
 - (50) For every programmed finite partial state I of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and for every natural number k holds $\text{ProgramPart}(\text{Relocated}(\text{Directed}(I), k)) = \text{Directed}(\text{ProgramPart}(\text{Relocated}(I, k)), \text{insloc}(\text{card } I + k))$.
 - (51) Let I, J be programmed finite partial states of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Then $\text{Directed}(I + \cdot J, l) = \text{Directed}(I, l) + \cdot \text{Directed}(J, l)$.
 - (52) For all macro instructions I, J holds $\text{Directed}(I; J) = I; \text{Directed}(J)$.
 - (53) Let I be a macro instruction and let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. If I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$, then $\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I; \text{Stop}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}})))(\text{LifeSpan}(s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I)) + 1)} = \text{insloc}(\text{card } I)$.
 - (54) Let I be a macro instruction and let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Suppose I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$. Then $(\text{Computation}(s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I)))(\text{LifeSpan}(s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I))) \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations}) = (\text{Computation}(s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I; \text{Stop}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}})))(\text{LifeSpan}(s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I)) + 1) \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations})$.
 - (55) Let I be a macro instruction and let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. If I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$, then $s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I; \text{Stop}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}})$ is halting.
 - (56) Let I be a macro instruction and let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. If I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$, then $\text{LifeSpan}(s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I; \text{Stop}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}})) = \text{LifeSpan}(s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I)) + 1$.
 - (57) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let I be a macro instruction. If I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$, then $\text{IExec}(I; \text{Stop}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}, s) = \text{IExec}(I, s) + \cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(\text{card } I))$.
 - (58) Let I, J be macro instructions and let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Suppose I is closed on s and halting on s . Then $I; \text{Goto}(\text{insloc}(\text{card } J + 1)); J; \text{Stop}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$ is closed on s and $I; \text{Goto}(\text{insloc}(\text{card } J + 1)); J; \text{Stop}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$ is halting on s .

- (59) Let I, J be macro instructions and let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. If I is closed on s and halting on s , then $s+\cdot((I; \text{Goto}(\text{insloc}(\text{card } J + 1))); J; \text{Stop}_{\text{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}})+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0))$ is halting.
- (60) Let I, J be macro instructions and let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. If I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$, then $s+\cdot \text{Initialized}(I; \text{Goto}(\text{insloc}(\text{card } J + 1))); J; \text{Stop}_{\text{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$ is halting.
- (61) Let I, J be macro instructions and let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. If I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$, then $\mathbf{ICIE}_{\text{Exec}}(I; \text{Goto}(\text{insloc}(\text{card } J + 1))); J; \text{Stop}_{\text{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}, s} = \text{insloc}(\text{card } I + \text{card } J + 1)$.
- (62) Let I, J be macro instructions and let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Suppose I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$. Then $\mathbf{IE}_{\text{Exec}}(I; \text{Goto}(\text{insloc}(\text{card } J + 1))); J; \text{Stop}_{\text{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}, s} = \mathbf{IE}_{\text{Exec}}(I, s)+\cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(\text{card } I + \text{card } J + 1))$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Noriko Asamoto. Constant assignment macro instructions of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Part II. *Formalized Mathematics*, 6(1):59–63, 1997.
- [2] Noriko Asamoto. Some multi instructions defined by sequence of instructions of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. *Formalized Mathematics*, 5(4):615–619, 1996.
- [3] Noriko Asamoto, Yatsuka Nakamura, Piotr Rudnicki, and Andrzej Trybulec. On the composition of macro instructions. Part III. *Formalized Mathematics*, 6(1):53–57, 1997.
- [4] Noriko Asamoto, Yatsuka Nakamura, Piotr Rudnicki, and Andrzej Trybulec. On the composition of macro instructions. Part II. *Formalized Mathematics*, 6(1):41–47, 1997.
- [5] Grzegorz Bancerek. Cardinal numbers. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(2):377–382, 1990.
- [6] Grzegorz Bancerek. The fundamental properties of natural numbers. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):41–46, 1990.
- [7] Grzegorz Bancerek and Krzysztof Hryniewiecki. Segments of natural numbers and finite sequences. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):107–114, 1990.
- [8] Grzegorz Bancerek and Piotr Rudnicki. Development of terminology for \mathbf{SCM} . *Formalized Mathematics*, 4(1):61–67, 1993.
- [9] Grzegorz Bancerek and Andrzej Trybulec. Miscellaneous facts about functions. *Formalized Mathematics*, 5(4):485–492, 1996.
- [10] Czesław Byliński. A classical first order language. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(4):669–676, 1990.
- [11] Czesław Byliński. Functions and their basic properties. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):55–65, 1990.
- [12] Czesław Byliński. The modification of a function by a function and the iteration of the composition of a function. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(3):521–527, 1990.
- [13] Yatsuka Nakamura and Andrzej Trybulec. A mathematical model of CPU. *Formalized Mathematics*, 3(2):151–160, 1992.
- [14] Piotr Rudnicki and Andrzej Trybulec. Memory handling for $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. *Formalized Mathematics*, 6(1):29–36, 1997.
- [15] Yasushi Tanaka. On the decomposition of the states of \mathbf{SCM} . *Formalized Mathematics*, 5(1):1–8, 1996.
- [16] Andrzej Trybulec. Tarski Grothendieck set theory. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):9–11, 1990.
- [17] Andrzej Trybulec and Yatsuka Nakamura. Modifying addresses of instructions of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. *Formalized Mathematics*, 5(4):571–576, 1996.
- [18] Andrzej Trybulec and Yatsuka Nakamura. Relocability for $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. *Formalized Mathematics*, 5(4):583–586, 1996.
- [19] Andrzej Trybulec and Yatsuka Nakamura. Some remarks on the simple concrete model of computer. *Formalized Mathematics*, 4(1):51–56, 1993.

- [20] Andrzej Trybulec, Yatsuka Nakamura, and Noriko Asamoto. On the compositions of macro instructions. Part I. *Formalized Mathematics*, 6(1):21–27, 1997.
- [21] Andrzej Trybulec, Yatsuka Nakamura, and Piotr Rudnicki. The $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ computer. *Formalized Mathematics*, 5(4):519–528, 1996.
- [22] Zinaida Trybulec and Halina Święczkowska. Boolean properties of sets. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):17–23, 1990.
- [23] Edmund Woronowicz. Relations and their basic properties. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):73–83, 1990.

Received August 27, 1996
