



Specifying and Verifying Programs (Part 1)

Wolfgang Schreiner
Wolfgang.Schreiner@risc.jku.at

Research Institute for Symbolic Computation (RISC)
Johannes Kepler University, Linz, Austria
<http://www.risc.jku.at>



Specifying and Verifying Programs



We will discuss three (closely interrelated) calculi.

- **Hoare Calculus:** $\{P\} c \{Q\}$

- If command c is executed in a pre-state with property P and terminates, it yields a post-state with property Q .

$$\{x = a \wedge y = b\} x := x + y \{x = a + y \wedge y = b\}$$

- **Predicate Transformers:** $wp(c, Q) = P$


- If the execution of command c shall yield a post-state with property Q , it must be executed in a pre-state with property P .

$$wp(x := x + y, x = a + y \wedge y = b) = (x + y = a + y \wedge y = b)$$

- **State Relations:** $c : [P \Rightarrow Q]^x, \dots$


- The post-state generated by the execution of command c is related to the pre-state by $P \Rightarrow Q$ (where only variables x, \dots have changed).

$$x = x + y : [\text{var } x = \text{old } x + \text{old } y]^x$$



-
- 1. The Hoare Calculus**
 2. Predicate Transformers
 3. Checking and Proving Verification Conditions
 4. Termination
 5. Abortion
 6. Procedures

The Hoare Calculus



First and best-known calculus for program reasoning (C.A.R. Hoare).

- **“Hoare triple”**: $\{P\} c \{Q\}$
 - Logical propositions P and Q , program command c .
 - The Hoare triple is itself a logical proposition.
 - The Hoare calculus gives rules for constructing true Hoare triples.
- **Partial correctness** interpretation of $\{P\} c \{Q\}$:

“If c is executed in a state in which P holds, then it terminates in a state in which Q holds **unless it aborts or runs forever.**”


 - Program does not produce wrong result.
 - But program also need not produce **any** result.
 - Abortion and non-termination are not (yet) ruled out.
- **Total correctness** interpretation of $\{P\} c \{Q\}$:

“If c is executed in a state in which P holds, then it terminates in a state in which Q holds.”

 - Program produces the correct result.

We will use the partial correctness interpretation for the moment.

The Rules of the Hoare Calculus




Hoare calculus rules are inference rules with Hoare triples as proof goals.

$$\frac{\{P_1\} c_1 \{Q_1\} \dots \{P_n\} c_n \{Q_n\} \quad VC_1, \dots, VC_m}{\{P\} c \{Q\}}$$

- Application of a rule to a triple $\{P\} c \{Q\}$ to be verified yields
 - other triples $\{P_1\} c_1 \{Q_1\} \dots \{P_n\} c_n \{Q_n\}$ to be verified, and
 - formulas VC_1, \dots, VC_m (the **verification conditions**) to be proved.
- Given a Hoare triple $\{P\} c \{Q\}$ as the root of the **verification tree**:
 - The rules are repeatedly applied until the leaves of the tree do not contain any more Hoare triples.
 - If all verification conditions in the tree can be proved, the root of the tree represents a valid Hoare triple.

The Hoare calculus generates verification conditions such that the validity of the conditions implies the validity of the original Hoare triple.



Weakening and Strengthening

$$\frac{P \Rightarrow P' \quad \{P'\} c \{Q'\} \quad Q' \Rightarrow Q}{\{P\} c \{Q\}}$$

- Logical derivation: $\frac{A_1 \ A_2}{B}$
 - Forward: If we have shown A_1 and A_2 , then we have also shown B .
 - Backward: To show B , it suffices to show A_1 and A_2 .
- Interpretation of above sentence:
 - To show that, if P holds, then Q holds after executing c , it suffices to show this for a P' weaker than P and a Q' stronger than Q .

Precondition may be weakened, postcondition may be strengthened.


Special Commands



$\{P\}$ **skip** $\{P\}$ $\{\text{true}\}$ **abort** $\{\text{false}\}$

- The **skip** command does not change the state; if P holds before its execution, then P thus holds afterwards as well.
- The **abort** command aborts execution and thus trivially satisfies partial correctness.
 - Axiom implies $\{P\}$ **abort** $\{Q\}$ for arbitrary P, Q .

Useful commands for reasoning and program transformations.



Scalar Assignments

$$\{Q[e/x]\} x := e \{Q\}$$

■ Syntax

- Variable x , expression e .
- $Q[e/x] \dots Q$ where every free occurrence of x is replaced by e .


■ Interpretation

- To make sure that Q holds for x after the assignment of e to x , it suffices to make sure that Q holds for e before the assignment.

■ Partial correctness

- Evaluation of e may abort.

$$\begin{array}{l} \{x + 3 < 5\} \quad x := x + 3 \quad \{x < 5\} \\ \{x < 2\} \quad x := x + 3 \quad \{x < 5\} \end{array}$$




Array Assignments

$$\{Q[a[i \mapsto e]/a]\} \ a[i] := e \ \{Q\}$$

- An array is modelled as a **function** $a : I \rightarrow V$.
 - Index set I , value set V .
 - $a[i] = e$... array a contains at index i the value e .
- **Term** $a[i \mapsto e]$ (“array a updated by assigning value e to index i ”)
 - A new array that contains at index i the value e .
 - All other elements of the array are the same as in a .
- **Thus array assignment becomes a special case of scalar assignment.**
 - Think of “ $a[i] := e$ ” as “ $a := a[i \mapsto e]$ ”.

$$\{\underline{a[i \mapsto x]}[1] > 0\} \ a[i] := x \ \{a[1] > 0\}$$

Arrays are here considered as basic values (no pointer semantics).



Array Assignments

How to reason about $a[i \mapsto e]$?

$$\begin{aligned} & Q[\underline{a[i \mapsto e]}[j]] \\ & \quad \rightsquigarrow \\ & (i = j \Rightarrow Q[e]) \wedge (i \neq j \Rightarrow Q[a[j]]) \end{aligned}$$

■ Array Axioms

$$\begin{aligned} i = j & \Rightarrow \underline{a[i \mapsto e]}[j] = e \\ i \neq j & \Rightarrow \underline{a[i \mapsto e]}[j] = a[j] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{array}{lll} \{ \underline{a[i \mapsto x]}[1] > 0 \} & a[i] := x & \{ a[1] > 0 \} \\ \{ (i = 1 \Rightarrow x > 0) \wedge (i \neq 1 \Rightarrow a[1] > 0) \} & a[i] := x & \{ a[1] > 0 \} \end{array}$$

Get rid of “array update terms” when applied to indices.

Command Sequences



$$\frac{\{P\} c_1 \{R\} \quad \{R\} c_2 \{Q\}}{\{P\} c_1; c_2 \{Q\}}$$

■ Interpretation

- To show that, if P holds before the execution of $c_1; c_2$, then Q holds afterwards, it suffices to show for some R that
 - if P holds before c_1 , that R holds afterwards, and that
 - if R holds before c_2 , then Q holds afterwards.


■ Problem: find suitable R .

- Easy in many cases (see later).

$$\frac{\{x + y - 1 > 0\} y := y - 1 \{x + y > 0\} \quad \{x + y > 0\} x := x + y \{x > 0\}}{\{x + y - 1 > 0\} y := y - 1; x := x + y \{x > 0\}}$$

The calculus itself does not indicate how to find intermediate property.

Conditionals



$$\frac{\{P \wedge b\} c_1 \{Q\} \quad \{P \wedge \neg b\} c_2 \{Q\}}{\{P\} \text{ if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2 \{Q\}}$$


$$\frac{\{P \wedge b\} c \{Q\} \quad (P \wedge \neg b) \Rightarrow Q}{\{P\} \text{ if } b \text{ then } c \{Q\}}$$

■ Interpretation

- To show that, if P holds before the execution of the conditional, then Q holds afterwards,
- it suffices to show that the same is true for each conditional branch, under the additional assumption that this branch is executed.

$$\frac{\{x \neq 0 \wedge x \geq 0\} y := x \quad \{y > 0\} \quad \{x \neq 0 \wedge x < 0\} y := -x \quad \{y > 0\}}{\{x \neq 0\} \text{ if } x \geq 0 \text{ then } y := x \text{ else } y := -x \quad \{y > 0\}}$$

Loops



$$\{\text{true}\} \text{ loop } \{\text{false}\} \quad \frac{\{I \wedge b\} c \{I\}}{\{I\} \text{ while } b \text{ do } c \{I \wedge \neg b\}}$$

■ Interpretation:

- The **loop** command does not terminate and thus trivially satisfies partial correctness.
 - Axiom implies $\{P\} \text{ loop } \{Q\}$ for arbitrary P, Q .
- If it is the case that
 - I holds before the execution of the **while**-loop and
 - I also holds after every iteration of the loop body,then I holds also after the execution of the loop (together with the negation of the loop condition b).
 - I is a **loop invariant**.

■ Problem:

- Rule for **while**-loop does not have arbitrary pre/post-conditions P, Q .

In practice, we combine this rule with the strengthening/weakening-rule.

Loops (Generalized)



$$\frac{P \Rightarrow I \quad \{I \wedge b\} c \{I\} \quad (I \wedge \neg b) \Rightarrow Q}{\{P\} \text{ while } b \text{ do } c \{Q\}}$$

■ Interpretation:


- To show that, if before the execution of a **while**-loop the property P holds, after its termination the property Q holds, it suffices to show for some property I (the **loop invariant**) that
 - I holds before the loop is executed (i.e. that P implies I),
 - if I holds when the loop body is entered (i.e. if also b holds), that after the execution of the loop body I still holds,
 - when the loop terminates (i.e. if b does not hold), I implies Q .

■ Problem: find appropriate loop invariant I .

- Strongest relationship between all variables modified in loop body.

The calculus itself does not indicate how to find suitable loop invariant.

Example



$$I :\Leftrightarrow s = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} j \wedge 1 \leq i \leq n + 1$$

$$(n \geq 0 \wedge i = 1 \wedge s = 0) \Rightarrow I$$

$$\{I \wedge i \leq n\} s := s + i; i := i + 1 \{I\}$$

$$(I \wedge i \not\leq n) \Rightarrow s = \sum_{j=1}^n j$$

$$\{n \geq 0 \wedge i = 1 \wedge s = 0\} \text{ while } i \leq n \text{ do } (s := s + i; i := i + 1) \{s = \sum_{j=1}^n j\}$$

The invariant captures the “essence” of a loop; only by giving its invariant, a true understanding of a loop is demonstrated.



-
1. The Hoare Calculus
 - 2. Predicate Transformers**
 3. Checking and Proving Verification Conditions
 4. Termination
 5. Abortion
 6. Procedures

Backward Reasoning



Implication of rule for command sequences and rule for assignments:

$$\frac{\{P\} c \{Q[e/x]\}}{\{P\} c; x := e \{Q\}}$$

■ Interpretation

- If the last command of a sequence is an assignment, we can remove the assignment from the proof obligation.
- By multiple application, assignment sequences can be removed from the back to the front.


$$\begin{array}{l} \{P\} \\ x := x+1; \\ y := 2*x; \\ z := x+y \\ \{z = 15\} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \{P\} \\ x := x+1; \\ y := 2*x; \\ \{x + y = 15\} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \{P\} \\ x := x+1; \\ \{x + 2x = 15\} \\ (\Leftrightarrow 3x = 15) \\ (\Leftrightarrow x = 5) \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \{P\} \\ \{x + 1 = 5\} \\ (\Leftrightarrow x = 4) \end{array}$$

$$P \Rightarrow x = 4$$




Weakest Preconditions

A calculus for “backward reasoning” (E.W. Dijkstra).

- **Predicate transformer wp**
 - Function “wp” that takes a command c and a postcondition Q and returns a precondition.
 - Read $wp(c, Q)$ as “the weakest precondition of c w.r.t. Q ”.
- $wp(c, Q)$ is a **precondition** for c that ensures Q as a postcondition.
 - Must satisfy $\{wp(c, Q)\} c \{Q\}$.
- $wp(c, Q)$ is the **weakest** such precondition.
 - Take any P such that $\{P\} c \{Q\}$.
 - Then $P \Rightarrow wp(c, Q)$.
- **Consequence:** $\{P\} c \{Q\}$ iff $(P \Rightarrow wp(c, Q))$
 - We want to prove $\{P\} c \{Q\}$.
 - We may prove $P \Rightarrow wp(c, Q)$ instead.

Verification is reduced to the calculation of weakest preconditions.



Weakest Preconditions

The weakest precondition of each program construct.

$$\text{wp}(\text{skip}, Q) = Q$$

$$\text{wp}(\text{abort}, Q) = \text{true}$$

$$\text{wp}(x := e, Q) = Q[e/x]$$

$$\text{wp}(c_1; c_2, Q) = \text{wp}(c_1, \text{wp}(c_2, Q))$$

$$\text{wp}(\text{if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2, Q) = (b \Rightarrow \text{wp}(c_1, Q)) \wedge (\neg b \Rightarrow \text{wp}(c_2, Q))$$

$$\text{wp}(\text{if } b \text{ then } c, Q) \Leftrightarrow (b \Rightarrow \text{wp}(c, Q)) \wedge (\neg b \Rightarrow Q)$$

$$\text{wp}(\text{while } b \text{ do } c, Q) = \dots$$

Loops represent a special problem (see later).

Forward Reasoning




Sometimes, we want to derive a postcondition from a given precondition.

$$\{P\} x := e \{ \exists x_0 : P[x_0/x] \wedge x = e[x_0/x] \}$$

■ Forward Reasoning

- What is the maximum we know about the post-state of an assignment $x := e$, if the pre-state satisfies P ?
- We know that P holds for some value x_0 (the value of x in the pre-state) and that x equals $e[x_0/x]$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \{x \geq 0 \wedge y = a\} \\ & \quad x := x + 1 \\ & \{ \exists x_0 : x_0 \geq 0 \wedge y = a \wedge x = x_0 + 1 \} \\ & (\Leftrightarrow (\exists x_0 : x_0 \geq 0 \wedge x = x_0 + 1) \wedge y = a) \\ & (\Leftrightarrow x > 0 \wedge y = a) \end{aligned}$$




Strongest Postcondition

A calculus for forward reasoning.

- **Predicate transformer sp**
 - Function “ sp ” that takes a precondition P and a command c and returns a postcondition.
 - Read $sp(c, P)$ as “the strongest postcondition of c w.r.t. P ”.
- $sp(c, P)$ is a **postcondition** for c that is ensured by precondition P .
 - Must satisfy $\{P\} c \{sp(c, P)\}$.
- $sp(c, P)$ is the **strongest** such postcondition.
 - Take any P, Q such that $\{P\} c \{Q\}$.
 - Then $sp(c, P) \Rightarrow Q$.
- **Consequence:** $\{P\} c \{Q\}$ iff $(sp(c, P) \Rightarrow Q)$.
 - We want to prove $\{P\} c \{Q\}$.
 - We may prove $sp(c, P) \Rightarrow Q$ instead.

Verification is reduced to the calculation of strongest postconditions.



Strongest Postconditions

The strongest postcondition of each program construct.

$$\text{sp}(\text{skip}, P) = P$$

$$\text{sp}(\text{abort}, P) = \text{false}$$

$$\text{sp}(x := e, P) = \exists x_0 : P[x_0/x] \wedge x = e[x_0/x]$$

$$\text{sp}(c_1; c_2, P) = \text{sp}(c_2, \text{sp}(c_1, P))$$

$$\text{sp}(\text{if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2, P) \Leftrightarrow \text{sp}(c_1, P \wedge b) \vee \text{sp}(c_2, P \wedge \neg b)$$

$$\text{sp}(\text{if } b \text{ then } c, P) = \text{sp}(c, P \wedge b) \vee (P \wedge \neg b)$$

$$\text{sp}(\text{while } b \text{ do } c, P) = \dots$$

Forward reasoning as a (less-known) alternative to backward-reasoning.

Hoare Calc. and Predicate Transformers



In practice, often a combination of the calculi is applied.


$$\{P\} c_1; \mathbf{while} b \mathbf{do} c; c_2 \{Q\}$$

- Assume c_1 and c_2 do not contain loop commands.
- It suffices to prove

$$\{\text{sp}(P, c_1)\} \mathbf{while} b \mathbf{do} c \{\text{wp}(c_2, Q)\}$$

Predicate transformers are applied to reduce the verification of a program to the Hoare-style verification of loops.

Weakest Liberal Preconditions for Loops



Why not apply predicate transformers to loops?

$$\text{wp}(\mathbf{loop}, Q) = \text{true}$$

$$\text{wp}(\mathbf{while } b \mathbf{ do } c, Q) = L_0(Q) \wedge L_1(Q) \wedge L_2(Q) \wedge \dots$$

$$L_0(Q) = \text{true}$$

$$L_{i+1}(Q) = (\neg b \Rightarrow Q) \wedge (b \Rightarrow \text{wp}(c, L_i(Q)))$$

■ Interpretation

- Weakest precondition that ensures that loops stops in a state satisfying Q , unless it aborts or runs forever.

■ Infinite sequence of predicates $L_i(Q)$:

- Weakest precondition that ensures that **after less than i iterations** the state satisfies Q , unless the loop aborts or does not yet terminate.

■ Alternative view: $L_i(Q) = \text{wp}(\text{if}_i, Q)$

$$\text{if}_0 = \mathbf{loop}$$

$$\text{if}_{i+1} = \mathbf{if } b \mathbf{ then } (c; \text{if}_i)$$

Example



$\text{wp}(\text{while } i < n \text{ do } i := i + 1, Q)$

$$L_0(Q) = \text{true}$$

$$L_1(Q) = (i \not< n \Rightarrow Q) \wedge (i < n \Rightarrow \text{wp}(i := i + 1, \text{true}))$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (i \not< n \Rightarrow Q) \wedge (i < n \Rightarrow \text{true})$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (i \not< n \Rightarrow Q)$$

$$L_2(Q) = (i \not< n \Rightarrow Q) \wedge (i < n \Rightarrow \text{wp}(i := i + 1, i \not< n \Rightarrow Q))$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (i \not< n \Rightarrow Q) \wedge$$

$$(i < n \Rightarrow (i + 1 \not< n \Rightarrow Q[i + 1/i]))$$

$$L_3(Q) = (i \not< n \Rightarrow Q) \wedge (i < n \Rightarrow \text{wp}(i := i + 1,$$

$$(i \not< n \Rightarrow Q) \wedge (i < n \Rightarrow (i + 1 \not< n \Rightarrow Q[i + 1/i])))$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (i \not< n \Rightarrow Q) \wedge$$

$$(i < n \Rightarrow ((i + 1 \not< n \Rightarrow Q[i + 1/i]) \wedge$$


$$(i + 1 < n \Rightarrow (i + 2 \not< n \Rightarrow Q[i + 2/i])))$$

Weakest Liberal Preconditions for Loops




- Sequence $L_i(Q)$ is monotonically increasing in strength:
 - $\forall i \in \mathbb{N} : L_{i+1}(Q) \Rightarrow L_i(Q)$.
- The weakest precondition is the “lowest upper bound”:
 - $\forall i \in \mathbb{N} : \text{wp}(\text{while } b \text{ do } c, Q) \Rightarrow L_i(Q)$.
 - $\forall P : (\forall i \in \mathbb{N} : P \Rightarrow L_i(Q)) \Rightarrow (P \Rightarrow \text{wp}(\text{while } b \text{ do } c, Q))$.
- We can only compute weaker **approximation** $L_i(Q)$.
 - $\text{wp}(\text{while } b \text{ do } c, Q) \Rightarrow L_i(Q)$.
- We want to prove $\{P\} \text{ while } b \text{ do } c \{Q\}$.
 - This is equivalent to proving $P \Rightarrow \text{wp}(\text{while } b \text{ do } c, Q)$.
 - Thus $P \Rightarrow L_i(Q)$ must hold as well.
- If we can prove $\neg(P \Rightarrow L_i(Q))$, ...
 - $\{P\} \text{ while } b \text{ do } c \{Q\}$ does **not** hold.
 - If we fail, we may try the easier proof $\neg(P \Rightarrow L_{i+1}(Q))$.

Falsification is possible by use of approximation L_i , but verification is not.



-
1. The Hoare Calculus
 2. Predicate Transformers
 - 3. Checking and Proving Verification Conditions**
 4. Termination
 5. Abortion
 6. Procedures



A Program Verification

Verification of the following Hoare triple:

$$\{olda = a \wedge oldx = x\}$$
$$i := 0; r := -1; n = |a|$$

while $i < n \wedge r = -1$ **do**

if $a[i] = x$

then $r := i$

else $i := i + 1$


$$\{a = olda \wedge x = oldx \wedge$$
$$((r = -1 \wedge \forall i : 0 \leq i < |a| \Rightarrow a[i] \neq x) \vee$$
$$(0 \leq r < |a| \wedge a[r] = x \wedge \forall i : 0 \leq i < r \Rightarrow a[i] \neq x))\}$$

Invariant $:\Leftrightarrow olda = a \wedge oldx = x \wedge n = |a| \wedge$

$$0 \leq i \leq n \wedge \forall j : 0 \leq j < i \Rightarrow a[j] \neq x \wedge$$
$$(r = -1 \vee (r = i \wedge i < n \wedge a[r] = x))$$

Find the smallest index r of an occurrence of value x in array a ($r = -1$, if x does not occur in a).


RISCAL: Checking the Invariant



```
val N:ℕ; val M:ℕ; val N0 = if N = 0 then -1 else -N; val N1 = -N0;
type index = ℤ[N0,N1]; type elem = ℕ[M]; type array = Array[N,elem];
```

```
proc search(a:array, x:elem): index
  ensures (result = -1 ∧ ∀i:index. 0 ≤ i ∧ i < N ⇒ a[i] ≠ x) ∨
    (0 ≤ result ∧ result < N ∧
      a[result] = x ∧ ∀i:index. 0 ≤ i ∧ i < result ⇒ a[i] ≠ x);
{
  var i:index = 0;
  var r:index = -1;
  while i < N ∧ r = -1 do
    invariant 0 ≤ i ∧ i ≤ N ∧ ∀j:index. 0 ≤ j ∧ j < i ⇒ a[j] ≠ x;
    invariant r = -1 ∨ (r = i ∧ i < N ∧ a[r] = x);
    {
      if a[i] = x
        then r := i;
        else i := i+1;
    }
  }
  return r;
}
```

We may validate that for some N, M the invariant is not too strong.



The Verification Conditions

$A : \Leftrightarrow \text{Input} \Rightarrow \text{Invariant}$

$B_1 : \Leftrightarrow \text{Invariant} \wedge i < n \wedge r = -1 \wedge a[i] = x \Rightarrow \text{Invariant}[i/r]$

$B_2 : \Leftrightarrow \text{Invariant} \wedge i < n \wedge r = -1 \wedge a[i] \neq x \Rightarrow \text{Invariant}[i + 1/i]$

$C : \Leftrightarrow \text{Invariant} \wedge \neg(i < n \wedge r = -1) \Rightarrow \text{Output}$

$\text{Input} : \Leftrightarrow \text{olda} = a \wedge \text{oldx} = x \wedge n = \text{length}(a) \wedge i = 0 \wedge r = -1$

$\text{Output} : \Leftrightarrow a = \text{olda} \wedge x = \text{oldx} \wedge$

$((r = -1 \wedge \forall i : 0 \leq i < \text{length}(a) \Rightarrow a[i] \neq x) \vee$

$(0 \leq r < \text{length}(a) \wedge a[r] = x \wedge \forall i : 0 \leq i < r \Rightarrow a[i] \neq x))$


$\text{Invariant} : \Leftrightarrow \text{olda} = a \wedge \text{oldx} = x \wedge n = |a| \wedge$

$0 \leq i \leq n \wedge \forall j : 0 \leq j < i \Rightarrow a[j] \neq x \wedge$

$(r = -1 \vee (r = i \wedge i < n \wedge a[r] = x))$

The verification conditions A, B_1, B_2, C must be valid.

RISCAL: Checking the Conditions




```
pred Input(i:index, r:index)  $\Leftrightarrow$   $i = 0 \wedge r = -1$ ;  
pred Output(a:array, x:elem, i:index, r:index)  $\Leftrightarrow$   
  ( $r = -1 \wedge \forall i:\text{index}. 0 \leq i \wedge i < N \Rightarrow a[i] \neq x$ )  $\vee$   
  ( $0 \leq r \wedge r < N \wedge a[r] = x \wedge \forall i:\text{index}. 0 \leq i \wedge i < r \Rightarrow a[i] \neq x$ );  
pred Invariant(a:array, x:elem, i:index, r:index)  $\Leftrightarrow$   
   $0 \leq i \wedge i \leq N \wedge (\forall j:\text{index}. 0 \leq j \wedge j < i \Rightarrow a[j] \neq x) \wedge$   
  ( $r = -1 \vee (r = i \wedge i < N \wedge a[r] = x)$ );
```

```
theorem A(a:array, x:elem, i:index, r:index)  $\Leftrightarrow$   
  Input(i, r)  $\Rightarrow$  Invariant(a, x, i, r);  
theorem B1(a:array, x:elem, i:index, r:index)  $\Leftrightarrow$   
  Invariant(a, x, i, r)  $\wedge i < N \wedge r = -1 \wedge a[i] = x \Rightarrow$   
    Invariant(a, x, i, i);  
theorem B2(a:array, x:elem, i:index, r:index)  $\Leftrightarrow$   
  Invariant(a, x, i, r)  $\wedge i < N \wedge r = -1 \wedge a[i] \neq x \Rightarrow$   
    Invariant(a, x, i+1, r);  
theorem C(a:array, x:elem, i:index, r:index)  $\Leftrightarrow$   
  Invariant(a, x, i, r)  $\wedge \neg(i < N \wedge r = -1) \Rightarrow$   
    Output(a, x, i, r);
```

We may validate that for some N, M the invariant is not too weak.

RISC ProofNavigator: A Theory of Arrays



```
% constructive array definition
newcontext "arrays2";

% the types
INDEX: TYPE = NAT;
ELEM:  TYPE;
ARR:   TYPE =
  [INDEX, ARRAY INDEX OF ELEM];

% error constants
any:    ARRAY INDEX OF ELEM;
anyelem: ELEM;
anyarray: ARR;

% a selector operation
content:
  ARR -> (ARRAY INDEX OF ELEM) =
    LAMBDA(a:ARR): a.1;

% the array operations
length: ARR -> INDEX =
  LAMBDA(a:ARR): a.0;
new: INDEX -> ARR =
  LAMBDA(n:INDEX): (n, any);
put: (ARR, INDEX, ELEM) -> ARR =
  LAMBDA(a:ARR, i:INDEX, e:ELEM):
    IF i < length(a)
      THEN (length(a),
            content(a) WITH [i]:=e)
      ELSE anyarray
    ENDIF;
get: (ARR, INDEX) -> ELEM =
  LAMBDA(a:ARR, i:INDEX):
    IF i < length(a)
      THEN content(a)[i]
      ELSE anyelem
    ENDIF;
```


Proof of Fundamental Array Properties



% the classical array axioms as formulas to be proved

length1: FORMULA

FORALL(n:INDEX): length(new(n)) = n;

length2: FORMULA

FORALL(a:ARR, i:INDEX, e:ELEM):

i < length(a) => length(put(a, i, e)) = length(a);

get1: FORMULA

FORALL(a:ARR, i:INDEX, e:ELEM):

i < length(a) => get(put(a, i, e), i) = e;

get2: FORMULA

FORALL(a:ARR, i, j:INDEX, e:ELEM):

i < length(a) AND j < length(a) AND

i /= j =>


get(put(a, i, e), j) = get(a, j);

▽ [adu]: expand length, get, put, content

▽ [c3b]: scatter

[qid]: proved (CVCL)

The Verification Conditions




```
newcontext      Input: BOOLEAN = olda = a AND oldx = x AND
  "linsearch";      n = length(a) AND i = 0 AND r = -1;

% declaration      Output: BOOLEAN = a = olda AND
% of arrays        ((r = -1 AND
...                (FORALL(j:NAT): j < length(a) =>
                   get(a,j) /= x)) OR
a: ARR;           (0 <= r AND r < length(a) AND get(a,r) = x AND
olda: ARR;        (FORALL(j:NAT):
x: ELEM;          j < r => get(a,j) /= x)));
oldx: ELEM;

i: NAT;           Invariant: (ARR, ELEM, NAT, NAT, INT) -> BOOLEAN =
n: NAT;           LAMBDA(a: ARR, x: ELEM, i: NAT, n: NAT, r: INT):
r: INT;           olda = a AND oldx = x AND
                  n = length(a) AND i <= n AND
                  (FORALL(j:NAT): j < i => get(a,j) /= x) AND
                  (r = -1 OR (r = i AND i < n AND get(a,r) = x));
...

```

The Verification Conditions (Contd)



...

A: FORMULA

Input \Rightarrow Invariant(a, x, i, n, r);

B1: FORMULA

Invariant(a, x, i, n, r) AND $i < n$ AND $r = -1$ AND $\text{get}(a,i) = x$
 \Rightarrow Invariant(a,x,i,n,i);


B2: FORMULA

Invariant(a, x, i, n, r) AND $i < n$ AND $r = -1$ AND $\text{get}(a,i) \neq x$
 \Rightarrow Invariant(a,x,i+1,n,r);

C: FORMULA

Invariant(a, x, i, n, r) AND NOT($i < n$ AND $r = -1$)
 \Rightarrow Output;

The Proofs



A: [bca]: expand Input, Invariant
[fuo]: scatter
[bxg]: proved (CVCL)

(2 user actions)

B1: [p1b]: expand Invariant
[lf6]: proved (CVCL)


(1 user action)

B2: [q1b]: expand Invariant in 6kv
[slx]: scatter
[a1y]: auto
[cch]: proved (CVCL)
[b1y]: proved (CVCL)
[c1y]: proved (CVCL)
[d1y]: proved (CVCL)
[e1y]: proved (CVCL)

(3 user actions)


C: [dca]: expand Invariant, Output in zfg
[tvy]: scatter
[dca]: auto
[t4c]: proved (CVCL)
[ecu]: split pkg
[kel]: proved (CVCL)
[lel]: scatter
[lvn]: auto
[lap]: proved (CVCL)
[fcu]: auto
[blt]: proved (CVCL)
[gcu]: proved (CVCL)

(6 user actions)



-
1. The Hoare Calculus
 2. Predicate Transformers
 3. Checking and Proving Verification Conditions
 - 4. Termination**
 5. Abortion
 6. Procedures

Termination



Hoare rules for **loop** and **while** are replaced as follows:

$$\frac{\{ \text{false} \} \text{ loop } \{ \text{false} \} \quad I \Rightarrow t \geq 0 \quad \{ I \wedge b \wedge t = N \} c \{ I \wedge t < N \}}{\{ I \} \text{ while } b \text{ do } c \{ I \wedge \neg b \}}$$

$$\frac{P \Rightarrow I \quad I \Rightarrow t \geq 0 \quad \{ I \wedge b \wedge t = N \} c \{ I \wedge t < N \} \quad (I \wedge \neg b) \Rightarrow Q}{\{ P \} \text{ while } b \text{ do } c \{ Q \}}$$

- New interpretation of $\{ P \} c \{ Q \}$.
 - If execution of c starts in a state where P holds, then execution **terminates** in a state where Q holds, unless it aborts.
 - Non-termination is ruled out, abortion not (yet).
 - The **loop** command thus does not satisfy total correctness.
- **Termination term t (type-checked to denote an integer)**.
 - Becomes smaller by every iteration of the loop.
 - But does not become negative.
 - Consequently, the loop must eventually terminate.

The initial value of t limits the number of loop iterations.

Any well-founded ordering may be used for the domain of t .

Example



$$I :\Leftrightarrow s = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} j \wedge 1 \leq i \leq n+1$$


$$(n \geq 0 \wedge i = 1 \wedge s = 0) \Rightarrow I \quad I \Rightarrow n - i + 1 \geq 0$$

$$\{I \wedge i \leq n \wedge n - i + 1 = N\} s := s + i; i := i + 1 \{I \wedge n - i + 1 < N\}$$

$$(I \wedge i \not\leq n) \Rightarrow s = \sum_{j=1}^n j$$

$$\{n \geq 0 \wedge i = 1 \wedge s = 0\} \text{ while } i \leq n \text{ do } (s := s + i; i := i + 1) \{s = \sum_{j=1}^n j\}$$

In practice, termination is easy to show (compared to partial correctness).



Weakest Preconditions for Loops

$\text{wp}(\text{loop}, Q) = \text{false}$

$\text{wp}(\text{while } b \text{ do } c, Q) = L_0(Q) \vee L_1(Q) \vee L_2(Q) \vee \dots$

$L_0(Q) = \text{false}$

$L_{i+1}(Q) = (\neg b \Rightarrow Q) \wedge (b \Rightarrow \text{wp}(c, L_i(Q)))$

■ New interpretation

- Weakest precondition that ensures that the loop terminates in a state in which Q holds, unless it aborts.

■ New interpretation of $L_i(Q)$

- Weakest precondition that ensures that the loop terminates **after less than i iterations** in a state in which Q holds, unless it aborts.

■ Preserves property: $\{P\} c \{Q\}$ iff $(P \Rightarrow \text{wp}(c, Q))$

- Now for **total correctness** interpretation of Hoare calculus.

■ Preserves alternative view: $L_i(Q) \Leftrightarrow \text{wp}(\text{if}_i, Q)$

$\text{if}_0 = \text{loop}$

$\text{if}_{i+1} = \text{if } b \text{ then } (c; \text{if}_i)$

Example



$wp(\mathbf{while} \ i < n \ \mathbf{do} \ i := i + 1, Q)$

$$L_0(Q) = \text{false}$$

$$L_1(Q) = (i \not< n \Rightarrow Q) \wedge (i < n \Rightarrow wp(i := i + 1, L_0(Q)))$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (i \not< n \Rightarrow Q) \wedge (i < n \Rightarrow \text{false})$$

$$\Leftrightarrow i \not< n \wedge Q$$

$$L_2(Q) = (i \not< n \Rightarrow Q) \wedge (i < n \Rightarrow wp(i := i + 1, L_1(Q)))$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (i \not< n \Rightarrow Q) \wedge$$

$$i < n \Rightarrow (i + 1 \not< n \wedge Q[i + 1/i])$$


$$L_3(Q) = (i \not< n \Rightarrow Q) \wedge (i < n \Rightarrow wp(i := i + 1, L_2(Q)))$$

$$\Leftrightarrow (i \not< n \Rightarrow Q) \wedge$$

$$(i < n \Rightarrow ((i + 1 \not< n \Rightarrow Q[i + 1/i]) \wedge$$

$$(i + 1 < n \Rightarrow (i + 2 \not< n \wedge Q[i + 2/i])))$$


...



Weakest Preconditions for Loops

- Sequence $L_i(Q)$ is now monotonically **decreasing** in strength:
 - $\forall i \in \mathbb{N} : L_i(Q) \Rightarrow L_{i+1}(Q)$.
- The weakest precondition is the “greatest lower bound”:
 - $\forall i \in \mathbb{N} : L_i(Q) \Rightarrow \text{wp}(\mathbf{while} \ b \ \mathbf{do} \ c, Q)$.
 - $\forall P : (\forall i \in \mathbb{N} : L_i(Q) \Rightarrow P) \Rightarrow (\text{wp}(\mathbf{while} \ b \ \mathbf{do} \ c, Q) \Rightarrow P)$.
- We can only compute a stronger approximation $L_i(Q)$.
 - $L_i(Q) \Rightarrow \text{wp}(\mathbf{while} \ b \ \mathbf{do} \ c, Q)$.
- We want to prove $\{P\} \ c \ \{Q\}$.
 - It suffices to prove $P \Rightarrow \text{wp}(\mathbf{while} \ b \ \mathbf{do} \ c, Q)$.
 - It thus also suffices to prove $P \Rightarrow L_i(Q)$.
 - If proof fails, we may try the easier proof $P \Rightarrow L_{i+1}(Q)$

However, verifications are typically not successful with any finite approximation of the weakest precondition.



-
1. The Hoare Calculus
 2. Predicate Transformers
 3. Checking and Proving Verification Conditions
 4. Termination
 - 5. Abortion**
 6. Procedures

Abortion




New rules to prevent abortion.

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\text{false}\} \text{ abort } \{\text{true}\} \\ & \{Q[e/x] \wedge D(e)\} x := e \{Q\} \\ & \{Q[a[i \mapsto e]/a] \wedge D(e) \wedge D(i) \wedge 0 \leq i < \text{length}(a)\} a[i] := e \{Q\} \end{aligned}$$

- New interpretation of $\{P\} c \{Q\}$.
 - If execution of c starts in a state, in which property P holds, then it does not abort and eventually terminates in a state in which Q holds.
- Sources of abortion.
 - Division by zero.
 - Index out of bounds exception.

$D(e)$ makes sure that every subexpression of e is well defined.

Definedness of Expressions



$$D(0) = \text{true.}$$

$$D(1) = \text{true.}$$

$$D(x) = \text{true.}$$

$$D(a[i]) = D(i) \wedge 0 \leq i < \text{length}(a).$$

$$D(e_1 + e_2) = D(e_1) \wedge D(e_2).$$

$$D(e_1 * e_2) = D(e_1) \wedge D(e_2).$$

$$D(e_1 / e_2) = D(e_1) \wedge D(e_2) \wedge e_2 \neq 0.$$

$$D(\text{true}) = \text{true.}$$

$$D(\text{false}) = \text{true.}$$

$$D(\neg b) = D(b).$$

$$D(b_1 \wedge b_2) = D(b_1) \wedge D(b_2).$$

$$D(b_1 \vee b_2) = D(b_1) \wedge D(b_2).$$

$$D(e_1 < e_2) = D(e_1) \wedge D(e_2).$$

$$D(e_1 \leq e_2) = D(e_1) \wedge D(e_2).$$

$$D(e_1 > e_2) = D(e_1) \wedge D(e_2).$$

$$D(e_1 \geq e_2) = D(e_1) \wedge D(e_2).$$

Assumes that expressions have already been type-checked.

Abortion




Slight modification of existing rules.

$$\frac{P \Rightarrow D(b) \quad \{P \wedge b\} c_1 \{Q\} \quad \{P \wedge \neg b\} c_2 \{Q\}}{\{P\} \text{ if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2 \{Q\}}$$

$$\frac{P \Rightarrow D(b) \quad \{P \wedge b\} c \{Q\} \quad (P \wedge \neg b) \Rightarrow Q}{\{P\} \text{ if } b \text{ then } c \{Q\}}$$

$$\frac{I \Rightarrow (t \geq 0 \wedge D(b)) \quad \{I \wedge b \wedge t = N\} c \{I \wedge t < N\}}{\{I\} \text{ while } b \text{ do } c \{I \wedge \neg b\}}$$

Expressions must be defined in any context.



Abortion

Similar modifications of weakest preconditions.

$$\text{wp}(\mathbf{abort}, Q) = \text{false}$$

$$\text{wp}(x := e, Q) = Q[e/x] \wedge D(e)$$

$$\text{wp}(\mathbf{if } b \mathbf{ then } c_1 \mathbf{ else } c_2, Q) =$$

$$D(b) \wedge (b \Rightarrow \text{wp}(c_1, Q)) \wedge (\neg b \Rightarrow \text{wp}(c_2, Q))$$

$$\text{wp}(\mathbf{if } b \mathbf{ then } c, Q) = D(b) \wedge (b \Rightarrow \text{wp}(c, Q)) \wedge (\neg b \Rightarrow Q)$$

$$\text{wp}(\mathbf{while } b \mathbf{ do } c, Q) = (L_0(Q) \vee L_1(Q) \vee L_2(Q) \vee \dots)$$

$$L_0(Q) = \text{false}$$

$$L_{i+1}(Q) = D(b) \wedge (\neg b \Rightarrow Q) \wedge (b \Rightarrow \text{wp}(c, L_i(Q)))$$

$\text{wp}(c, Q)$ now makes sure that the execution of c does not abort but eventually terminates in a state in which Q holds.



-
1. The Hoare Calculus
 2. Predicate Transformers
 3. Checking and Proving Verification Conditions
 4. Termination
 5. Abortion
 - 6. Procedures**

Procedure Specifications




global g ;
requires Pre ;
ensures $Post$;
 $o := p(i) \{ c \}$

- Specification of a procedure p implemented by a command c .
 - Input parameter i , output parameter o , global variable g .
 - Command c may read/write i , o , and g .
 - Precondition Pre (may refer to i, g).
 - Postcondition $Post$ (may refer to i, o, g, g_0).
 - g_0 denotes the value of g before the execution of p .
- Proof obligation

$$\{ Pre \wedge i_0 = i \wedge g_0 = g \} c \{ Post[i_0/i] \}$$

Proof of the correctness of the implementation of a procedure with respect to its specification.

Example



■ Procedure specification:

global g

requires $g \geq 0 \wedge i > 0$

ensures $g_0 = g \cdot i + o \wedge 0 \leq o < i$

$o := p(i) \{ o := g \% i; g := g / i \}$

■ Proof obligation:


$\{g \geq 0 \wedge i > 0 \wedge i_0 = i \wedge g_0 = g\}$

$o := g \% i; g := g / i$

$\{g_0 = g \cdot i_0 + o \wedge 0 \leq o < i_0\}$

A procedure that divides g by i and returns the remainder.

Procedure Calls



A call of p provides actual input argument e and output variable x .

$$x := p(e)$$

Similar to assignment statement; we thus first give an alternative (equivalent) version of the assignment rule.

- Original:

$$\frac{\{D(e) \wedge Q[e/x]\}}{x := e} \{Q\}$$

- Alternative:

$$\frac{\{D(e) \wedge \forall x' : x' = e \Rightarrow Q[x'/x]\}}{x := e} \{Q\}$$

The new value of x is given name x' in the precondition.

Procedure Calls




From this, we can derive a rule for the correctness of procedure calls.

$$\begin{array}{c} \{D(e) \wedge Pre[e/i] \wedge \\ \forall x', g' : Post[e/i, x'/o, g'/g_0, g'/g] \Rightarrow Q[x'/x, g'/g]\} \\ x := p(e) \\ \{Q\} \end{array}$$

- $Pre[e/i]$ refers to the values of the actual argument e (rather than to the formal parameter i).
- x' and g' denote the values of the vars x and g after the call.
- $Post[. . .]$ refers to the argument values before and after the call.
- $Q[x'/x, g'/g]$ refers to the argument values after the call.

Modular reasoning: rule only relies on the *specification* of p , not on its implementation.

Corresponding Predicate Transformers




$$\begin{aligned} \text{wp}(x = p(e), Q) = & \\ & D(e) \wedge \text{Pre}[e/i] \wedge \\ & \forall x', g' : \\ & \quad \text{Post}[e/i, x'/o, g/g_0, g'/g] \Rightarrow Q[x'/x, g'/g] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sp}(P, x = p(e)) = & \\ & \exists x_0, g_0 : \\ & \quad P[x_0/y, g_0/g] \wedge \\ & \quad (\text{Pre}[e[x_0/x, g_0/g]/i, g_0/g] \Rightarrow \text{Post}[e[x_0/x, g_0/g]/i, x/o]) \end{aligned}$$

Explicit naming of old/new values required.

Example



■ Procedure specification:

global g

requires $g \geq 0 \wedge i > 0$

ensures $g_0 = g \cdot i + o \wedge 0 \leq o < i$

$o = p(i) \{ o := g \% i; g := g / i \}$

■ Procedure call:

$\{g \geq 0 \wedge g = N \wedge b \geq 0\}$

$x = p(b + 1)$

$\{g \cdot (b + 1) \leq N < (g + 1) \cdot (b + 1)\}$

■ To be proved:

$g \geq 0 \wedge g = N \wedge b \geq 0 \Rightarrow$

$D(b + 1) \wedge g \geq 0 \wedge b + 1 > 0 \wedge$

$\forall x', g' :$

$g = g' \cdot (b + 1) + x' \wedge 0 \leq x' < b + 1 \Rightarrow$

$g' \cdot (b + 1) \leq N < (g' + 1) \cdot (b + 1)$