

SCMPDS Is Not Standard

Artur Kornilowicz¹
University of Białystok

Yasunari Shidama
Shinshu University
Nagano

Summary. The aim of the paper is to show that SCMPDS ([8]) does not belong to the class of standard computers ([16]).

MML Identifier: SCMPDS_9.

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

1. PRELIMINARIES

In this paper r , s are real numbers.

We now state several propositions:

- (1) $0 \leq r + |r|$.
- (2) $0 \leq -r + |r|$.
- (3) If $|r| = |s|$, then $r = s$ or $r = -s$.
- (4) For all natural numbers i , j such that $i < j$ and $i \neq 0$ holds $\frac{i}{j}$ is not integer.
- (5) $\{2 \cdot k; k \text{ ranges over natural numbers: } k > 1\}$ is infinite.
- (6) For every function f and for all sets a , b , c such that $a \neq c$ holds $(f + \cdot (a \mapsto b))(c) = f(c)$.
- (7) For every function f and for all sets a , b , c , d such that $a \neq b$ holds $(f + \cdot [a \mapsto c, b \mapsto d])(a) = c$ and $(f + \cdot [a \mapsto c, b \mapsto d])(b) = d$.

¹This paper was written during the first author's post-doctoral fellowship granted by Shinshu University, Japan.

2. SCMPDS

For simplicity, we adopt the following rules: a, b are Int positions, i is an instruction of SCMPDS, l is an instruction-location of SCMPDS, and k, k_1, k_2 are integers.

Let l_1, l_2 be Int positions and let a, b be integers. Then $[l_1 \mapsto a, l_2 \mapsto b]$ is a finite partial state of SCMPDS.

One can verify that SCMPDS has non trivial instruction locations.

Let l be an instruction-location of SCMPDS. The functor $\text{locnum}(l)$ yields a natural number and is defined by:

(Def. 1) $\mathbf{i}_{\text{locnum}(l)} = l$.

Let l be an instruction-location of SCMPDS. Then $\text{locnum}(l)$ is an element of \mathbb{N} .

We now state a number of propositions:

- (8) $l = 2 \cdot \text{locnum}(l) + 2$.
- (9) For all instruction-locations l_3, l_4 of SCMPDS such that $l_3 \neq l_4$ holds $\text{locnum}(l_3) \neq \text{locnum}(l_4)$.
- (10) For all instruction-locations l_3, l_4 of SCMPDS such that $l_3 \neq l_4$ holds $\text{Next}(l_3) \neq \text{Next}(l_4)$.
- (11) Let N be a set with non empty elements, S be an IC-Ins-separated definite non empty non void AMI over N , i be an instruction of S , and l be an instruction-location of S . Then $\text{JUMP}(i) \subseteq \text{NIC}(i, l)$.
- (12) If for every state s of SCMPDS such that $\mathbf{IC}_s = l$ and $s(l) = i$ holds $(\text{Exec}(i, s))(\mathbf{IC}_{\text{SCMPDS}}) = \text{Next}(\mathbf{IC}_s)$, then $\text{NIC}(i, l) = \{\text{Next}(l)\}$.
- (13) If for every instruction-location l of SCMPDS holds $\text{NIC}(i, l) = \{\text{Next}(l)\}$, then $\text{JUMP}(i)$ is empty.
- (14) $\text{NIC}(\text{goto } k, l) = \{2 \cdot |k + \text{locnum}(l)| + 2\}$.
- (15) $\text{NIC}(\text{return } a, l) = \{2 \cdot k; k \text{ ranges over natural numbers: } k > 1\}$.
- (16) $\text{NIC}(\text{saveIC}(a, k_1), l) = \{\text{Next}(l)\}$.
- (17) $\text{NIC}(a := k_1, l) = \{\text{Next}(l)\}$.
- (18) $\text{NIC}(a_{k_1} := k_2, l) = \{\text{Next}(l)\}$.
- (19) $\text{NIC}((a, k_1) := (b, k_2), l) = \{\text{Next}(l)\}$.
- (20) $\text{NIC}(\text{AddTo}(a, k_1, k_2), l) = \{\text{Next}(l)\}$.
- (21) $\text{NIC}(\text{AddTo}(a, k_1, b, k_2), l) = \{\text{Next}(l)\}$.
- (22) $\text{NIC}(\text{SubFrom}(a, k_1, b, k_2), l) = \{\text{Next}(l)\}$.
- (23) $\text{NIC}(\text{MultBy}(a, k_1, b, k_2), l) = \{\text{Next}(l)\}$.
- (24) $\text{NIC}(\text{Divide}(a, k_1, b, k_2), l) = \{\text{Next}(l)\}$.
- (25) $\text{NIC}((a, k_1) <> 0 \text{-goto } k_2, l) = \{\text{Next}(l), |2 \cdot (k_2 + \text{locnum}(l))| + 2\}$.
- (26) $\text{NIC}((a, k_1) \leq 0 \text{-goto } k_2, l) = \{\text{Next}(l), |2 \cdot (k_2 + \text{locnum}(l))| + 2\}$.

(27) $\text{NIC}((a, k_1) \geq 0_goto\ k_2, l) = \{\text{Next}(l), |2 \cdot (k_2 + \text{locnum}(l))| + 2\}$.

Let us consider k . Observe that $\text{JUMP}(\text{goto } k)$ is empty.

Next we state the proposition

(28) $\text{JUMP}(\text{return } a) = \{2 \cdot k; k \text{ ranges over natural numbers: } k > 1\}$.

Let us consider a . Note that $\text{JUMP}(\text{return } a)$ is infinite.

Let us consider a, k_1 . One can verify that $\text{JUMP}(\text{saveIC}(a, k_1))$ is empty.

Let us consider a, k_1 . Observe that $\text{JUMP}(a := k_1)$ is empty.

Let us consider a, k_1, k_2 . Note that $\text{JUMP}(a_{k_1} := k_2)$ is empty.

Let us consider a, b, k_1, k_2 . One can check that $\text{JUMP}((a, k_1) := (b, k_2))$ is empty.

Let us consider a, k_1, k_2 . One can verify that $\text{JUMP}(\text{AddTo}(a, k_1, k_2))$ is empty.

Let us consider a, b, k_1, k_2 . One can verify the following observations:

- * $\text{JUMP}(\text{AddTo}(a, k_1, b, k_2))$ is empty,
- * $\text{JUMP}(\text{SubFrom}(a, k_1, b, k_2))$ is empty,
- * $\text{JUMP}(\text{MultBy}(a, k_1, b, k_2))$ is empty, and
- * $\text{JUMP}(\text{Divide}(a, k_1, b, k_2))$ is empty.

Let us consider a, k_1, k_2 . One can verify the following observations:

- * $\text{JUMP}((a, k_1) <> 0_goto\ k_2)$ is empty,
- * $\text{JUMP}((a, k_1) \leq 0_goto\ k_2)$ is empty, and
- * $\text{JUMP}((a, k_1) \geq 0_goto\ k_2)$ is empty.

Next we state two propositions:

(29) $\text{SUCC}(l) =$ the instruction locations of SCMPDS.

(30) Let N be a set with non empty elements, S be an IC-Ins-separated definite non empty non void AMI over N , and l_3, l_4 be instruction-locations of S . If $\text{SUCC}(l_3) =$ the instruction locations of S , then $l_3 \leq l_4$.

Let us mention that SCMPDS is non InsLoc-antisymmetric.

One can verify that SCMPDS is non standard.

REFERENCES

- [1] Grzegorz Bancerek. The fundamental properties of natural numbers. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):41–46, 1990.
- [2] Grzegorz Bancerek. The ordinal numbers. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):91–96, 1990.
- [3] Grzegorz Bancerek. Sequences of ordinal numbers. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(2):281–290, 1990.
- [4] Grzegorz Bancerek and Krzysztof Hryniewiecki. Segments of natural numbers and finite sequences. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):107–114, 1990.
- [5] Czesław Byliński. A classical first order language. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(4):669–676, 1990.
- [6] Czesław Byliński. Functions and their basic properties. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):55–65, 1990.
- [7] 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.

- [8] Jing-Chao Chen. The SCMPDS computer and the basic semantics of its instructions. *Formalized Mathematics*, 8(1):183–191, 1999.
- [9] Agata Darmochwał. Finite sets. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):165–167, 1990.
- [10] Yatsuka Nakamura and Andrzej Trybulec. A mathematical model of CPU. *Formalized Mathematics*, 3(2):151–160, 1992.
- [11] Beata Padlewska. Families of sets. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):147–152, 1990.
- [12] Jan Popiołek. Some properties of functions modul and signum. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(2):263–264, 1990.
- [13] Andrzej Trybulec. Subsets of complex numbers. *To appear in Formalized Mathematics*.
- [14] Andrzej Trybulec. Tarski Grothendieck set theory. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):9–11, 1990.
- [15] Andrzej Trybulec and Yatsuka Nakamura. Some remarks on the simple concrete model of computer. *Formalized Mathematics*, 4(1):51–56, 1993.
- [16] Andrzej Trybulec, Piotr Rudnicki, and Artur Korniłowicz. Standard ordering of instruction locations. *Formalized Mathematics*, 9(2):291–301, 2001.
- [17] Michał J. Trybulec. Integers. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(3):501–505, 1990.
- [18] Wojciech A. Trybulec. Groups. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(5):821–827, 1990.
- [19] Zinaida Trybulec. Properties of subsets. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):67–71, 1990.
- [20] Edmund Woronowicz. Relations and their basic properties. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):73–83, 1990.

Received September 27, 2003
