

On the Composition of Macro Instructions of Standard Computers

Artur Korniłowicz
University of Białystok

MML Identifier: AMISTD-2.

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

1. PRELIMINARIES

We follow the rules: k, m are natural numbers, x, X are sets, and N is a set with non empty elements.

Let f be a function and let g be a non empty function. One can verify that $f + \cdot g$ is non empty and $g + \cdot f$ is non empty.

Let f, g be finite functions. Note that $f + \cdot g$ is finite.

Next we state two propositions:

- (1) For all functions f, g holds $\text{dom } f \approx \text{dom } g$ iff $f \approx g$.
- (2) For all finite functions f, g such that $\text{dom } f \cap \text{dom } g = \emptyset$ holds $\text{card}(f + \cdot g) = \text{card } f + \text{card } g$.

Let f be a function and let A be a set. Note that $f \setminus A$ is function-like and relation-like.

One can prove the following two propositions:

- (3) For all functions f, g such that $x \in \text{dom } f \setminus \text{dom } g$ holds $(f \setminus g)(x) = f(x)$.
- (4) For every non empty finite set F holds $\text{card } F - 1 = \text{card } F - ' 1$.

2. PRODUCT LIKE SETS

Let S be a functional set. The functor \prod_S yields a function and is defined as follows:

- (Def. 1)(i) For every set x holds $x \in \text{dom } \prod_S$ iff for every function f such that $f \in S$ holds $x \in \text{dom } f$ and for every set i such that $i \in \text{dom } \prod_S$ holds $\prod_S(i) = \pi_i S$ if S is non empty,
(ii) $\prod_S = \emptyset$, otherwise.

The following two propositions are true:

- (5) For every non empty functional set S holds $\text{dom } \prod_S = \bigcap \{\text{dom } f : f \text{ ranges over elements of } S\}$.
(6) For every non empty functional set S and for every set i such that $i \in \text{dom } \prod_S$ holds $\prod_S(i) = \{f(i) : f \text{ ranges over elements of } S\}$.

Let S be a set. We say that S is product-like if and only if:

- (Def. 2) There exists a function f such that $S = \prod f$.

Let f be a function. One can check that $\prod f$ is product-like.

Let us mention that every set which is product-like is also functional and has common domain.

Let us observe that there exists a set which is product-like and non empty.

The following four propositions are true:

- (7) For every functional set S with common domain holds $\text{dom } \prod_S = \text{DOM}(S)$.
(8) For every functional set S and for every set i such that $i \in \text{dom } \prod_S$ holds $\prod_S(i) = \pi_i S$.
(9) For every functional set S with common domain holds $S \subseteq \prod \prod_S$.
(10) For every non empty product-like set S holds $S = \prod \prod_S$.

Let D be a set. Observe that every set of finite sequences of D is functional.

Let i be a natural number and let D be a set. One can check that D^i has common domain.

Let i be a natural number and let D be a set. Note that D^i is product-like.

3. PROPERTIES OF AMI-STRUCT

One can prove the following propositions:

- (11) Let N be a set, S be an AMI over N , and F be a finite partial state of S . Then $F \setminus X$ is a finite partial state of S .

- (12) Let S be a von Neumann definite AMI over N and F be a programmed finite partial state of S . Then $F \setminus X$ is a programmed finite partial state of S .

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a von Neumann definite AMI over N , let i_1, i_2 be instruction-locations of S , and let I_1, I_2 be elements of the instructions of S . Then $[i_1 \mapsto I_1, i_2 \mapsto I_2]$ is a finite partial state of S .

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be a halting AMI over N . Observe that there exists an instruction of S which is halting.

We now state three propositions:

- (13) Let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , F be a lower programmed finite partial state of S , and G be a programmed finite partial state of S . If $\text{dom } F = \text{dom } G$, then G is lower.
- (14) Let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , F be a lower programmed finite partial state of S , and f be an instruction-location of S . If $f \in \text{dom } F$, then $\text{locnum}(f) < \text{card } F$.
- (15) Let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and F be a lower programmed finite partial state of S . Then $\text{dom } F = \{\text{il}_S(k); k \text{ ranges over natural numbers: } k < \text{card } F\}$.

Let N be a set, let S be an AMI over N , and let I be an element of the instructions of S . The functor $\text{AddressPart}(I)$ is defined by:

(Def. 3) $\text{AddressPart}(I) = I_2$.

Let N be a set, let S be an AMI over N , and let I be an element of the instructions of S . Then $\text{AddressPart}(I)$ is a finite sequence of elements of $\bigcup N \cup$ the objects of S .

We now state the proposition

- (16) Let N be a set, S be an AMI over N , and I, J be elements of the instructions of S . If $\text{InsCode}(I) = \text{InsCode}(J)$ and $\text{AddressPart}(I) = \text{AddressPart}(J)$, then $I = J$.

Let N be a set and let S be an AMI over N . We say that S is homogeneous if and only if:

- (Def. 4) For all instructions I, J of S such that $\text{InsCode}(I) = \text{InsCode}(J)$ holds $\text{dom AddressPart}(I) = \text{dom AddressPart}(J)$.

The following proposition is true

- (17) For every instruction I of $\text{STC}(N)$ holds $\text{AddressPart}(I) = 0$.

Let N be a set, let S be an AMI over N , and let T be an instruction type of S . The functor $\text{AddressParts } T$ is defined by:

- (Def. 5) $\text{AddressParts } T = \{\text{AddressPart}(I); I \text{ ranges over instructions of } S: \text{InsCode}(I) = T\}$.

Let N be a set, let S be an AMI over N , and let T be an instruction type of S . One can check that $\text{AddressParts } T$ is functional.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let I be an instruction of S . We say that I is explicit-jump-instruction if and only if the condition (Def. 6) is satisfied.

(Def. 6) Let f be a set. Suppose $f \in \text{JUMP}(I)$. Then there exists a set k such that $k \in \text{dom AddressPart}(I)$ and $f = (\text{AddressPart}(I))(k)$ and $\prod_{\text{AddressParts InsCode}(I)}(k) = \text{the instruction locations of } S$.

We say that I has ins-loc-in-jump if and only if the condition (Def. 7) is satisfied.

(Def. 7) Let f be a set. Given a set k such that $k \in \text{dom AddressPart}(I)$ and $f = (\text{AddressPart}(I))(k)$ and $\prod_{\text{AddressParts InsCode}(I)}(k) = \text{the instruction locations of } S$. Then $f \in \text{JUMP}(I)$.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be a von Neumann definite AMI over N . We say that S is explicit-jump-instruction if and only if:

(Def. 8) Every instruction of S is explicit-jump-instruction.

We say that S has ins-loc-in-jump if and only if:

(Def. 9) Every instruction of S has ins-loc-in-jump.

Let N be a set and let S be an AMI over N . We say that S has non trivial instruction locations if and only if:

(Def. 10) The instruction locations of S are non trivial.

Let N be a set with non empty elements. Note that every von Neumann definite AMI over N which is standard has non trivial instruction locations.

Let N be a set with non empty elements. One can verify that there exists a von Neumann definite AMI over N which is standard.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be an AMI over N with non trivial instruction locations. Observe that the instruction locations of S is non trivial.

The following proposition is true

(18) Let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and I be an instruction of S . If for every instruction-location f of S holds $\text{NIC}(I, f) = \{\text{NextLoc } f\}$, then $\text{JUMP}(I)$ is empty.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let I be an instruction of $\text{STC}(N)$. Observe that $\text{JUMP}(I)$ is empty.

Let N be a set and let S be an AMI over N . We say that S is regular if and only if:

(Def. 11) For every instruction type T of S holds $\text{AddressParts } T$ is product-like.

Next we state the proposition

(19) For every instruction type T of $\text{STC}(N)$ holds $\text{AddressParts } T = \{0\}$.

Let N be a set with non empty elements. Observe that $\text{STC}(N)$ is homogeneous explicit-jump-instruction and regular and has ins-loc-in-jump.

Let N be a set with non empty elements. Note that there exists a von Neumann definite AMI over N which is standard, halting, realistic, steady-programmed, programmable, explicit-jump-instruction, homogeneous, and regular and has non trivial instruction locations and ins-loc-in-jump.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a regular AMI over N , and let T be an instruction type of S . Observe that $\text{AddressParts}T$ is product-like.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a homogeneous AMI over N , and let T be an instruction type of S . Observe that $\text{AddressParts}T$ has common domain.

Next we state the proposition

- (20) Let S be a homogeneous AMI over N , I be an instruction of S , and x be a set. Suppose $x \in \text{dom AddressPart}(I)$. Suppose $\prod_{\text{AddressParts InsCode}(I)}(x) =$ the instruction locations of S . Then $(\text{AddressPart}(I))(x)$ is an instruction-location of S .

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be an explicit-jump-instruction von Neumann definite AMI over N . Note that every instruction of S is explicit-jump-instruction.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be a von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump. Observe that every instruction of S has ins-loc-in-jump.

The following proposition is true

- (21) Let S be a realistic von Neumann definite AMI over N with non trivial instruction locations and I be an instruction of S . If I is halting, then $\text{JUMP}(I)$ is empty.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a halting realistic von Neumann definite AMI over N with non trivial instruction locations, and let I be a halting instruction of S . One can verify that $\text{JUMP}(I)$ is empty.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be a von Neumann definite AMI over N with non trivial instruction locations. Observe that there exists a finite partial state of S which is non trivial and programmed.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be a standard halting von Neumann definite AMI over N . One can verify that every non empty programmed finite partial state of S which is trivial is also unique-halt.

Let N be a set, let S be an AMI over N , and let I be an instruction of S . We say that I is instruction location free if and only if:

- (Def. 12) For every set x such that $x \in \text{dom AddressPart}(I)$ holds $\prod_{\text{AddressParts InsCode}(I)}(x) \neq$ the instruction locations of S .

The following propositions are true:

- (22) Let S be a halting explicit-jump-instruction realistic von Neumann definite AMI over N with non trivial instruction locations and I be an instruction of S . If I is instruction location free, then $\text{JUMP}(I)$ is empty.

- (23) Let S be a realistic von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump and non trivial instruction locations and I be an instruction of S . If I is halting, then I is instruction location free.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be a realistic von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump and non trivial instruction locations. Observe that every instruction of S which is halting is also instruction location free.

We now state the proposition

- (24) Let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump and I be an instruction of S . If I is sequential, then I is instruction location free.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump. One can check that every instruction of S which is sequential is also instruction location free.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be a standard halting von Neumann definite AMI over N . The functor $\text{Stop } S$ yielding a finite partial state of S is defined by:

(Def. 13) $\text{Stop } S = \text{il}_S(0) \dashrightarrow \mathbf{halt}_S$.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be a standard halting von Neumann definite AMI over N . Note that $\text{Stop } S$ is lower non empty programmed and trivial.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be a standard realistic halting von Neumann definite AMI over N . One can check that $\text{Stop } S$ is closed.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be a standard halting steady-programmed von Neumann definite AMI over N . Note that $\text{Stop } S$ is autonomic.

We now state three propositions:

- (25) For every standard halting von Neumann definite AMI S over N holds $\text{card } \text{Stop } S = 1$.
- (26) Let S be a standard halting von Neumann definite AMI over N and F be a pre-Macro of S . If $\text{card } F = 1$, then $F = \text{Stop } S$.
- (27) For every standard halting von Neumann definite AMI S over N holds $\text{LastLoc } \text{Stop } S = \text{il}_S(0)$.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be a standard halting von Neumann definite AMI over N . Note that $\text{Stop } S$ is halt-ending and unique-halt.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be a standard halting von Neumann definite AMI over N . Then $\text{Stop } S$ is a pre-Macro of S .

4. ON THE COMPOSITION OF MACRO INSTRUCTIONS

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , let I be an element of the instructions of S , and let k be a natural number. The functor $\text{IncAddr}(I, k)$ yielding an instruction of S is defined by the conditions (Def. 14).

- (Def. 14)(i) $\text{InsCode}(\text{IncAddr}(I, k)) = \text{InsCode}(I)$,
(ii) $\text{dom AddressPart}(\text{IncAddr}(I, k)) = \text{dom AddressPart}(I)$, and
(iii) for every set n such that $n \in \text{dom AddressPart}(I)$ holds if $\prod_{\text{AddressParts InsCode}(I)}(n) =$ the instruction locations of S , then there exists an instruction-location f of S such that $f = (\text{AddressPart}(I))(n)$ and $(\text{AddressPart}(\text{IncAddr}(I, k)))(n) = \text{il}_S(k + \text{locnum}(f))$ and if $\prod_{\text{AddressParts InsCode}(I)}(n) \neq$ the instruction locations of S , then $(\text{AddressPart}(\text{IncAddr}(I, k)))(n) = (\text{AddressPart}(I))(n)$.

Next we state three propositions:

- (28) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and I be an element of the instructions of S . Then $\text{IncAddr}(I, 0) = I$.
(29) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and I be an instruction of S . If I is instruction location free, then $\text{IncAddr}(I, k) = I$.
(30) Let S be a halting standard realistic homogeneous regular von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump. Then $\text{IncAddr}(\mathbf{halt}_S, k) = \mathbf{halt}_S$.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a halting standard realistic homogeneous regular von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump, let I be a halting instruction of S , and let k be a natural number. Observe that $\text{IncAddr}(I, k)$ is halting.

We now state several propositions:

- (31) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and I be an instruction of S . Then $\text{AddressParts InsCode}(I) = \text{AddressParts InsCode}(\text{IncAddr}(I, k))$.
(32) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and I, J be instructions of S . Given a natural number k such that $\text{IncAddr}(I, k) = \text{IncAddr}(J, k)$. Suppose $\prod_{\text{AddressParts InsCode}(I)}(x) =$ the instruction locations of S . Then $\prod_{\text{AddressParts InsCode}(J)}(x) =$ the instruction locations of S .
(33) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and I, J be instructions of S . Given a natural number k such that $\text{IncAddr}(I, k) = \text{IncAddr}(J, k)$. Suppose $\prod_{\text{AddressParts InsCode}(I)}(x) \neq$ the

instruction locations of S . Then $\prod_{\text{AddressParts InsCode}(J)}(x) \neq$ the instruction locations of S .

- (34) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and I, J be instructions of S . If there exists a natural number k such that $\text{IncAddr}(I, k) = \text{IncAddr}(J, k)$, then $I = J$.
- (35) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard halting realistic von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump and I be an instruction of S . If $\text{IncAddr}(I, k) = \mathbf{halt}_S$, then $I = \mathbf{halt}_S$.
- (36) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard halting realistic von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump and I be an instruction of S . If I is sequential, then $\text{IncAddr}(I, k)$ is sequential.
- (37) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and I be an instruction of S . Then $\text{IncAddr}(\text{IncAddr}(I, k), m) = \text{IncAddr}(I, k + m)$.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , let p be a programmed finite partial state of S , and let k be a natural number. The functor $\text{IncAddr}(p, k)$ yields a finite partial state of S and is defined as follows:

- (Def. 15) $\text{dom IncAddr}(p, k) = \text{dom } p$ and for every natural number m such that $\text{il}_S(m) \in \text{dom } p$ holds $(\text{IncAddr}(p, k))(\text{il}_S(m)) = \text{IncAddr}(\pi_{\text{il}_S(m)}p, k)$.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , let F be a programmed finite partial state of S , and let k be a natural number. One can check that $\text{IncAddr}(F, k)$ is programmed.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , let F be an empty programmed finite partial state of S , and let k be a natural number. One can verify that $\text{IncAddr}(F, k)$ is empty.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , let F be a non empty programmed finite partial state of S , and let k be a natural number. One can verify that $\text{IncAddr}(F, k)$ is non empty.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , let F be a lower programmed finite partial state of S , and let k be a natural number. One can verify that $\text{IncAddr}(F, k)$ is lower.

The following propositions are true:

- (38) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and F be a programmed finite partial state of S . Then $\text{IncAddr}(F, 0) = F$.

- (39) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and F be a lower programmed finite partial state of S . Then $\text{IncAddr}(\text{IncAddr}(F, k), m) = \text{IncAddr}(F, k + m)$.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , let p be a finite partial state of S , and let k be a natural number. The functor $\text{Shift}(p, k)$ yielding a finite partial state of S is defined by the conditions (Def. 16).

- (Def. 16)(i) $\text{dom Shift}(p, k) = \{\text{il}_S(m + k); m \text{ ranges over natural numbers: } \text{il}_S(m) \in \text{dom } p\}$, and
(ii) for every natural number m such that $\text{il}_S(m) \in \text{dom } p$ holds $(\text{Shift}(p, k))(\text{il}_S(m + k)) = p(\text{il}_S(m))$.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , let F be a finite partial state of S , and let k be a natural number. Note that $\text{Shift}(F, k)$ is programmed.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , let F be an empty finite partial state of S , and let k be a natural number. One can check that $\text{Shift}(F, k)$ is empty.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , let F be a non empty programmed finite partial state of S , and let k be a natural number. One can check that $\text{Shift}(F, k)$ is non empty.

We now state four propositions:

- (40) Let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and F be a programmed finite partial state of S . Then $\text{Shift}(F, 0) = F$.
(41) Let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , F be a finite partial state of S , and k be a natural number. If $k > 0$, then $\text{il}_S(0) \notin \text{dom Shift}(F, k)$.
(42) Let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and F be a finite partial state of S . Then $\text{Shift}(\text{Shift}(F, m), k) = \text{Shift}(F, m + k)$.
(43) Let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and F be a programmed finite partial state of S . Then $\text{dom } F \approx \text{dom Shift}(F, k)$.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let I be an instruction of S . We say that I is IC-good if and only if:

- (Def. 17) For every natural number k and for all states s_1, s_2 of S such that $s_2 = s_1 + \cdot (\mathbf{IC}_{S^+ \rightarrow}(\mathbf{IC}_{(s_1)} + k))$ holds $\mathbf{IC}_{\text{Exec}(I, s_1)} + k = \mathbf{IC}_{\text{Exec}(\text{IncAddr}(I, k), s_2)}$.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N . We say that S is IC-good if and only if:

- (Def. 18) Every instruction of S is IC-good.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be an AMI over N , and let I be an instruction of S . We say that I is Exec-preserving if and only if the condition (Def. 19) is satisfied.

(Def. 19) Let s_1, s_2 be states of S . Suppose s_1 and s_2 are equal outside the instruction locations of S . Then $\text{Exec}(I, s_1)$ and $\text{Exec}(I, s_2)$ are equal outside the instruction locations of S .

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be an AMI over N . We say that S is Exec-preserving if and only if:

(Def. 20) Every instruction of S is Exec-preserving.

One can prove the following proposition

(44) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump and I be an instruction of S . If I is sequential, then I is IC-good.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump. Observe that every instruction of S which is sequential is also IC-good.

The following proposition is true

(45) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard realistic von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump and I be an instruction of S . If I is halting, then I is IC-good.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be a homogeneous regular standard realistic von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump. Note that every instruction of S which is halting is also IC-good.

The following proposition is true

(46) For every AMI S over N and for every instruction I of S such that I is halting holds I is Exec-preserving.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be an AMI over N . Observe that every instruction of S which is halting is also Exec-preserving.

Let N be a set with non empty elements. One can verify that $\text{STC}(N)$ is IC-good and Exec-preserving.

Let N be a set with non empty elements. One can check that there exists a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N which is halting, realistic, steady-programmed, programmable, explicit-jump-instruction, IC-good, and Exec-preserving and has ins-loc-in-jump and non trivial instruction locations.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be an IC-good homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N . Note that every instruction of S is IC-good.

Let N be a set with non empty elements and let S be an Exec-preserving AMI over N . Note that every instruction of S is Exec-preserving.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let F be a non empty programmed finite partial state of S . The functor $\text{CutLastLoc } F$ yielding a finite partial state of S is defined by:

(Def. 21) $\text{CutLastLoc } F = F \setminus (\text{LastLoc } F \mapsto F(\text{LastLoc } F))$.

The following propositions are true:

- (47) Let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and F be a non empty programmed finite partial state of S . Then $\text{dom } \text{CutLastLoc } F = \text{dom } F \setminus \{\text{LastLoc } F\}$.
- (48) Let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and F be a non empty programmed finite partial state of S . Then $\text{dom } F = \text{dom } \text{CutLastLoc } F \cup \{\text{LastLoc } F\}$.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let F be a non empty trivial programmed finite partial state of S . Note that $\text{CutLastLoc } F$ is empty.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let F be a non empty programmed finite partial state of S . Observe that $\text{CutLastLoc } F$ is programmed.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let F be a lower non empty programmed finite partial state of S . Note that $\text{CutLastLoc } F$ is lower.

We now state three propositions:

- (49) Let S be a standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and F be a non empty programmed finite partial state of S . Then $\text{card } \text{CutLastLoc } F = \text{card } F - 1$.
- (50) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , F be a lower non empty programmed finite partial state of S , and G be a non empty programmed finite partial state of S . Then $\text{dom } \text{CutLastLoc } F \cap \text{dom } \text{Shift}(\text{IncAddr}(G, \text{card } F - 1), \text{card } F - 1) = \emptyset$.
- (51) Let S be a standard halting von Neumann definite AMI over N , F be a unique-halt lower non empty programmed finite partial state of S , and I be an instruction-location of S . If $I \in \text{dom } \text{CutLastLoc } F$, then $(\text{CutLastLoc } F)(I) \neq \mathbf{halt}_S$.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let F, G be non empty programmed finite partial states of S . The functor $F; G$ yields a finite partial state of S and is defined by:

(Def. 22) $F; G = \text{CutLastLoc } F + \text{Shift}(\text{IncAddr}(G, \text{card } F - 1), \text{card } F - 1)$.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let F, G be non empty

programmed finite partial states of S . Note that $F; G$ is non empty and programmed.

We now state the proposition

- (52) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and F, G be lower non empty programmed finite partial states of S . Then $\text{card}(F; G) = (\text{card } F + \text{card } G) - 1$ and $\text{card}(F; G) = (\text{card } F + \text{card } G) - 1$.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let F, G be lower non empty programmed finite partial states of S . Observe that $F; G$ is lower.

We now state four propositions:

- (53) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and F, G be lower non empty programmed finite partial states of S . Then $\text{dom } F \subseteq \text{dom}(F; G)$.
- (54) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and F, G be lower non empty programmed finite partial states of S . Then $\text{CutLastLoc } F \subseteq \text{CutLastLoc } F; G$.
- (55) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N and F, G be lower non empty programmed finite partial states of S . Then $(F; G)(\text{LastLoc } F) = (\text{IncAddr}(G, \text{card } F - 1))(\text{il}_S(0))$.
- (56) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , F, G be lower non empty programmed finite partial states of S , and f be an instruction-location of S . If $\text{locnum}(f) < \text{card } F - 1$, then $(\text{IncAddr}(F, \text{card } F - 1))(f) = (\text{IncAddr}(F; G, \text{card } F - 1))(f)$.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a homogeneous regular standard realistic halting steady-programmed von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump, and let F, G be halt-ending lower non empty programmed finite partial states of S . Observe that $F; G$ is halt-ending.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a homogeneous regular standard realistic halting steady-programmed von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump, and let F, G be halt-ending unique-halt lower non empty programmed finite partial states of S . Observe that $F; G$ is unique-halt.

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a homogeneous regular standard realistic halting steady-programmed von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump, and let F, G be pre-Macros of S . Then $F; G$ is a pre-Macro of S .

Let N be a set with non empty elements, let S be a realistic halting steady-programmed IC-good Exec-preserving homogeneous regular standard von Neumann definite AMI over N , and let F, G be closed lower non empty programmed finite partial states of S . Observe that $F; G$ is closed.

We now state several propositions:

- (57) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard halting realistic von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump. Then $\text{IncAddr}(\text{Stop } S, k) = \text{Stop } S$.
- (58) For every standard halting von Neumann definite AMI S over N holds $\text{Shift}(\text{Stop } S, k) = \text{il}_S(k) \dashv\rightarrow \mathbf{halt}_S$.
- (59) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard halting realistic von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump and F be a pre-Macro of S . Then $F; \text{Stop } S = F$.
- (60) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard halting von Neumann definite AMI over N and F be a pre-Macro of S . Then $\text{Stop } S; F = F$.
- (61) Let S be a homogeneous regular standard realistic halting steady-programmed von Neumann definite AMI over N with ins-loc-in-jump and F, G, H be pre-Macros of S . Then $(F; G); H = F; (G; H)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Grzegorz Bancerek. Cardinal numbers. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(2):377–382, 1990.
- [2] Grzegorz Bancerek. The fundamental properties of natural numbers. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):41–46, 1990.
- [3] Grzegorz Bancerek. König's theorem. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(3):589–593, 1990.
- [4] Grzegorz Bancerek and Krzysztof Hryniewiecki. Segments of natural numbers and finite sequences. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):107–114, 1990.
- [5] Czesław Byliński. Functions and their basic properties. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):55–65, 1990.
- [6] 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.
- [7] Czesław Byliński. Some basic properties of sets. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):47–53, 1990.
- [8] Agata Darmochwał. Finite sets. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):165–167, 1990.
- [9] Krzysztof Hryniewiecki. Basic properties of real numbers. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):35–40, 1990.
- [10] Beata Madras. Products of many sorted algebras. *Formalized Mathematics*, 5(1):55–60, 1996.
- [11] Yatsuka Nakamura and Andrzej Trybulec. A mathematical model of CPU. *Formalized Mathematics*, 3(2):151–160, 1992.
- [12] Takaya Nishiyama and Yasuho Mizuhara. Binary arithmetics. *Formalized Mathematics*, 4(1):83–86, 1993.
- [13] Beata Padlewska. Families of sets. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):147–152, 1990.
- [14] Andrzej Trybulec. Domains and their Cartesian products. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):115–122, 1990.
- [15] Andrzej Trybulec. Function domains and Frænkel operator. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(3):495–500, 1990.
- [16] Andrzej Trybulec. Tarski Grothendieck set theory. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):9–11, 1990.
- [17] Andrzej Trybulec and Yatsuka Nakamura. Some remarks on the simple concrete model of computer. *Formalized Mathematics*, 4(1):51–56, 1993.
- [18] Andrzej Trybulec, Piotr Rudnicki, and Artur Kornilowicz. Standard ordering of instruction locations. *Formalized Mathematics*, 9(2):291–301, 2001.
- [19] Zinaida Trybulec. Properties of subsets. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):67–71, 1990.
- [20] Zinaida Trybulec and Halina Świączkowska. Boolean properties of sets. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):17–23, 1990.

- [21] Edmund Woronowicz. Relations and their basic properties. *Formalized Mathematics*, 1(1):73–83, 1990.

Received April 14, 2000
