

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

Part I

Noriko Asamoto
Ochanomizu University
Tokyo

MML Identifier: SCMFSA8A.

WWW: <http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/scmfsa8a.html>

The articles [14], [5], [10], [20], [9], [11], [8], [4], [6], [12], [15], [13], [19], [16], [17], [7], [18], [2], [3], and [1] provide the notation and terminology for this paper.

One can prove the following propositions:

- (2)¹ For all functions f, g and for every set D such that $\text{dom } g$ misses D holds $(f+\cdot g)\upharpoonright D = f\upharpoonright D$, where $D = \text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations}$.
- (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 $\mathbf{IC}_{\text{IExec}(I,s)} = \mathbf{IC}_{\text{Result}(s+\cdot \text{Initialized}(I))}$.
- (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 $\mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}}$ and for every instruction-location l of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}}$ 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 $\mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}}$, I be a macro instruction, and l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}}$. 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 $\mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}}$ and l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}}$. Then $\text{dom}(s\upharpoonright \text{the instruction locations of } \mathbf{SCM}_{\mathbf{FSA}})$ misses $\text{dom Start-At}(l)$.

¹ The proposition (1) has been removed.

- (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 $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$, I_1, I_2 be macro instructions, and 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 by:

(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.

One can prove the following 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 $\text{dom Directed}(P, l) = \text{dom } P$.
- (20) Let P be a programmed finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and 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 $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$, l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$, and x be a set such that $x \in \text{dom } P$. Then
- (i) if $P(x) = \mathbf{halt}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$, then $(\text{Directed}(P, l))(x) = \text{goto } l$, and
 - (ii) 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 $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$, a be an integer location, and 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 $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$, n be a natural number, and 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 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 $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$, l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$, and 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 $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Observe that $\text{Directed}(I, l)$ is good.

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

Let I be a macro instruction and let l be an instruction-location of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Note 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 as follows:

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

Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let P be an initial finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. We say that P is pseudo-closed on s if and only if the condition (Def. 3) is satisfied.

(Def. 3) There exists a natural number k such that $\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+(P+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(k)} = \text{insloc}(\text{card ProgramPart}(P))$ and for every natural number n such that $n < k$ holds $\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+(P+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(n)} \in \text{dom } P$.

Let P be an initial finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. We say that P is pseudo-paraclosed if and only if:

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

Let us note that there exists a macro instruction which is pseudo-paraclosed.

Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and let P be an initial finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Let us assume that P is pseudo-closed on s . The functor $\text{pseudo-LifeSpan}(s, P)$ yields a natural number and is defined by:

(Def. 5) $\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+(P+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(\text{pseudo-LifeSpan}(s, P))} = \text{insloc}(\text{card ProgramPart}(P))$ and for every natural number n such that $\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+(P+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(n)} \notin \text{dom } P$ holds $\text{pseudo-LifeSpan}(s, P) \leq n$.

One can prove the following propositions:

(28) For all macro instructions I, J and for every set 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 x be a set such that $x \in \text{dom } P$. Then

- (i) if $P(x) = \mathbf{halt}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$, then $(\text{Directed}(P))(x) = \text{goto insloc}(\text{card } P)$, and
- (ii) 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 P be an initial finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Suppose P is pseudo-closed on s . Let n be a natural number. If $n < \text{pseudo-LifeSpan}(s, P)$, then $\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+(P+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(n)} \in \text{dom } P$ and $\text{CurInstr}((\text{Computation}(s+(P+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(n)) \neq \mathbf{halt}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$.

(32) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and I, J be macro instructions. Suppose I is pseudo-closed on s . Let k be a natural number. Suppose $k \leq \text{pseudo-LifeSpan}(s, I)$. Then $(\text{Computation}(s+(I+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(k)$ and $(\text{Computation}(s+((I; J)+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(k)$ 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 I be a macro instruction. Suppose I is closed on s and halting on s . Let k be a natural number. Suppose $k \leq \text{LifeSpan}(s+(I+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0))))$. Then $(\text{Computation}(s+(I+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(k)$ and $(\text{Computation}(s+(\text{Directed}(I)+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(k)$ are equal outside the instruction locations of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and $\text{CurInstr}((\text{Computation}(s+(\text{Directed}(I)+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(k)) \neq \mathbf{halt}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$.
- (36) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and I be a macro instruction. Suppose I is closed on s and halting on s . Then $\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s+(\text{Directed}(I)+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+(I+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0))))+1)} = \text{insloc}(\text{card } I)$ and $(\text{Computation}(s+(I+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+(I+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))) \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations}(\text{Computation}(s+(\text{Directed}(I)+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+(I+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0))))+1) \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations}))$.
- (37) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and I be a macro instruction. If I is closed on s and halting on s , then $\text{Directed}(I)$ is pseudo-closed on s .
- (38) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and I be a macro instruction. If I is closed on s and halting on s , then $\text{pseudo-LifeSpan}(s, \text{Directed}(I)) = \text{LifeSpan}(s+(I+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))) + 1$.
- (39) Let I be a programmed finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and 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 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) $(\text{Computation}(s+(\text{Directed}(I)+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+(I+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0))))+1) \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations}) = (\text{Computation}(s+((I; J)+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0)))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+(I+\text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(0))))+1) \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations})$, 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 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) $(\text{Computation}(s+\text{Initialized}(\text{Directed}(I))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+\text{Initialized}(I))+1) \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations}) = (\text{Computation}(s+\text{Initialized}(I; J)))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+\text{Initialized}(I))+1) \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations})$, 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 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 $\text{CurInstr}((\text{Computation}(s+\text{Initialized}(\text{Directed}(I))))(k)) \neq \mathbf{halt}_{\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$.
- (45) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and 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 $(\text{Computation}(s+\text{Initialized}(I)))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+\text{Initialized}(I))) \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations}) = (\text{Computation}(s+\text{Initialized}(\text{Directed}(I))))(\text{LifeSpan}(s+\text{Initialized}(I))+1) \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations})$.
- (46) Let I be a macro instruction and 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 $\text{insloc}(0) \in \text{domGoto}(l)$ and $(\text{Goto}(l))(\text{insloc}(0)) = \text{goto } l$.
- (48) Let N be a set with non empty elements, S be a definite non empty non void AMI over N , I be a programmed finite partial state of S , and x be a set. If $x \in \text{dom}I$, then $I(x)$ is an instruction of S .
- (49) Let I be a programmed finite partial state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$, x be a set, and k be a natural number. If $x \in \text{domProgramPart}(\text{Relocated}(I, k))$, 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 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 s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. If I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$, then $\mathbf{IC}_{(\text{Computation}(s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I; \text{Stop}_{\text{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}})))(\text{LifeSpan}(s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I)) + 1)} = \text{insloc}(\text{card } I)$.
- (54) Let I be a macro instruction and s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Suppose I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$. Then $(\text{Computation}(s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I)))(\text{LifeSpan}(s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I))) \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations}) = (\text{Computation}(s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I; \text{Stop}_{\text{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}})))(\text{LifeSpan}(s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I)) + 1) \upharpoonright (\text{Int-Locations} \cup \text{FinSeq-Locations})$.
- (55) Let I be a macro instruction and s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. If I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$, then $s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I; \text{Stop}_{\text{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}})$ is halting.
- (56) Let I be a macro instruction and s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. If I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$, then $\text{LifeSpan}(s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I; \text{Stop}_{\text{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}})) = \text{LifeSpan}(s + \cdot \text{Initialized}(I)) + 1$.
- (57) Let s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$ and I be a macro instruction. If I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$, then $\mathbf{IExec}(I; \text{Stop}_{\text{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}, s) = \mathbf{IExec}(I, s) + \cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(\text{card } I))$.
- (58) Let I, J be macro instructions and s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Suppose I is closed on s and halting on s . Then $I; \text{Goto}(\text{insloc}(\text{card } J + 1)); J; \text{Stop}_{\text{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$ is closed on s and $I; \text{Goto}(\text{insloc}(\text{card } J + 1)); J; \text{Stop}_{\text{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}$ is halting on s .
- (59) Let I, J be macro instructions and 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 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 s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. If I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$, then $\mathbf{IC}_{\mathbf{IExec}(I; \text{Goto}(\text{insloc}(\text{card } J + 1)); J; \text{Stop}_{\text{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}, s)} = \text{insloc}(\text{card } I + \text{card } J + 1)$.
- (62) Let I, J be macro instructions and s be a state of $\mathbf{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}$. Suppose I is closed on $\text{Initialize}(s)$ and halting on $\text{Initialize}(s)$. Then $\mathbf{IExec}(I; \text{Goto}(\text{insloc}(\text{card } J + 1)); J; \text{Stop}_{\text{SCM}_{\text{FSA}}}, s) = \mathbf{IExec}(I, s) + \cdot \text{Start-At}(\text{insloc}(\text{card } I + \text{card } J + 1))$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Noriko Asamoto. Constant assignment macro instructions of SCM_{FSA} . Part II. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. <http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/scmfsa7b.html>.
- [2] Noriko Asamoto, Yatsuka Nakamura, Piotr Rudnicki, and Andrzej Trybulec. On the composition of macro instructions. Part II. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. <http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/scmfsa6b.html>.
- [3] Noriko Asamoto, Yatsuka Nakamura, Piotr Rudnicki, and Andrzej Trybulec. On the composition of macro instructions. Part III. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. <http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/scmfsa6c.html>.
- [4] Grzegorz Bancerek. Cardinal numbers. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/card_1.html.
- [5] Grzegorz Bancerek. The fundamental properties of natural numbers. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/nat_1.html.
- [6] Grzegorz Bancerek and Krzysztof Hryniewiecki. Segments of natural numbers and finite sequences. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/finseq_1.html.
- [7] Grzegorz Bancerek and Piotr Rudnicki. Development of terminology for scm . *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 5, 1993. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol5/scm_1.html.
- [8] Grzegorz Bancerek and Andrzej Trybulec. Miscellaneous facts about functions. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/funct_7.html.
- [9] Czesław Byliński. Functions and their basic properties. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/funct_1.html.
- [10] Czesław Byliński. A classical first order language. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 2, 1990. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol2/cqc_lang.html.
- [11] Czesław Byliński. The modification of a function by a function and the iteration of the composition of a function. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 2, 1990. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol2/funct_4.html.
- [12] Yatsuka Nakamura and Andrzej Trybulec. A mathematical model of CPU. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 4, 1992. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol4/ami_1.html.
- [13] Yasushi Tanaka. On the decomposition of the states of SCM . *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 5, 1993. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol5/ami_5.html.
- [14] Andrzej Trybulec. Tarski Grothendieck set theory. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, Axiomatics, 1989. <http://mizar.org/JFM/Axiomatics/tarski.html>.
- [15] Andrzej Trybulec and Yatsuka Nakamura. Some remarks on the simple concrete model of computer. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 5, 1993. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol5/ami_3.html.
- [16] Andrzej Trybulec and Yatsuka Nakamura. Modifying addresses of instructions of SCM_{FSA} . *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/scmfsa_4.html.
- [17] Andrzej Trybulec and Yatsuka Nakamura. Relocability for SCM_{FSA} . *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/scmfsa_5.html.
- [18] Andrzej Trybulec, Yatsuka Nakamura, and Noriko Asamoto. On the compositions of macro instructions. Part I. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. <http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/scmfsa6a.html>.
- [19] Andrzej Trybulec, Yatsuka Nakamura, and Piotr Rudnicki. The SCM_{FSA} computer. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 8, 1996. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol8/scmfsa_2.html.
- [20] Edmund Woronowicz. Relations and their basic properties. *Journal of Formalized Mathematics*, 1, 1989. http://mizar.org/JFM/Vol1/relat_1.html.

Received August 27, 1996

Published January 2, 2004
