Lecture 14–15: Hoare Logic

17-355/17-665/17-819: Program Analysis
Rohan Padhye
October 21 & 23, 2025

* Course materials developed with Jonathan Aldrich and Claire Le Goues





Heads up: Course Projects

- Scope: ~3 weeks of effort at end of course
- Some options
 - Implement a non-trivial analysis and evaluate it on some code
 - Empirically evaluate an existing analysis tool
 - Contribute meaningfully to an open source analysis tool
 - Explore an extension to the state of the art in program analysis
- Students in the Masters version (17-665) must engage with nontrivial codebases
 - Either the analysis framework or the target program must be in active use by the developer community
- Students in the Ph.D. version (17-819) must engage in research in some way
 - OK to extend your current research work can be empirical as well





Logical Reasoning about Code

- So far, we've reasoned about code using operational semantics
 - And built program analyses that abstract those semantics
- Axiomatic semantics define meaning of a program in terms of assertions
 - Enables logic-based reasoning about code
- Enables verification
 - Prove arbitrary properties about code not just ones built into a particular analysis
 - Goes back to Turing (1949): "Checking a Large Routine"
 - Hoare developed rules in the 1960s for verifying the WHILE language



Axiomatic Semantics

- An axiomatic semantics consists of:
 - A language for stating assertions about programs,
 - Rules for establishing the truth of assertions
- Some typical kinds of assertions:
 - This program terminates
 - If this program terminates, the variables x and y have the same value throughout the execution of the program
 - The array accesses are within the array bounds
- Assertions are in a logic, e.g. first-order logic
 - Alternatives include temporal logic, linear logic, etc.





Assertion Language

$$P:= ext{true} \quad | ext{ false} \quad | e_1 = e_2 \quad | e_1 \geqslant e_2 \quad | P_1 \wedge P_2$$
 $| P_1 \vee P_2 \quad | P_1 \Rightarrow P_2 \quad | \forall x.P \quad | \exists x.P$

- We'll be a bit sloppy and mix logical and program variables like x
- We'll treat Boolean expressions as a special case of assertions

Hoare Triple

$$\{P\}S\{Q\}$$

- *P* is the precondition
- *Q* is the postcondition
- S is any statement (in While, at least for our class)
- Semantics: if P holds in some state E and if $\langle S; E \rangle \Downarrow E'$, then Q holds in E'
 - This is partial correctness: termination of S is not guaranteed
 - Total correctness additionally implies termination, and is written [P] S [Q]

Exercise: Exploring Hoare Triples

 What are reasonable pre- or post- conditions for the following incomplete Hoare triples?

Hoare Triple

$$\{P\}S\{Q\}$$

- *P* is the precondition
- *Q* is the postcondition
- S is any statement (in While, at least for our class)
- Semantics: if P holds in some state E and if $\langle S; E \rangle \downarrow E'$, then Q holds in E'
 - This is partial correctness: termination of S is not guaranteed
 - Total correctness additionally implies termination, and is written [P] S [Q]

Assertion Semantics

• $E \models P$ means P is true in E

• Rules: $E \vDash \text{true}$ always $E \vDash a_1 = a_2$ $iff \langle E, a_1 \rangle \Downarrow n \text{ and } \langle E, a_2 \rangle \Downarrow n$ $E \vDash a_1 \geqslant a_2$ $iff \langle E, a_1 \rangle \Downarrow n_1, \langle E, a_2 \rangle \Downarrow n_2, \text{ and } n_1 \geqslant n_2$ $E \vDash P_1 \land P_2$ $iff E \vDash P_1 \text{ and } E \vDash P_2$...

$$E \models \exists x.P$$
 iff $\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}.E[x \mapsto n] \models P$
 $E \models \exists x.P$ iff $\exists n \in \mathbb{Z}.E[x \mapsto n] \models P$

Semantics of Hoare Triples

• A partial correctness assertion $\models \{P\} S \{Q\}$ is defined formally to mean:

$$\forall E. \forall E'. (E \models P \land \langle E, S \rangle \Downarrow E') \Rightarrow E' \models Q$$

• How would we define total correctness [P] S [Q]?

• This is a good formal definition—but it doesn't help us prove many assertions because we have to reason about all environments. How can we do better?

Derivation Rules for Logical Formulas

- We can define rules for proving the validity of logical formulas
 - $\vdash P$ is read "we can prove P"
- Example rule:

$$\frac{\vdash P \vdash Q}{\vdash P \land Q}$$
 and

Derivation Rules for Hoare Logic

• Judgment form $\vdash \{P\} S \{Q\}$ means "we can prove the Hoare triple $\{P\} S \{Q\}$ "

$$\frac{}{\vdash \{P\} \text{ skip } \{P\}} \ ^{skip} \ \ \frac{}{\vdash \{[a/x]P\} \ x \coloneqq a \ \{P\}} \ ^{assign}$$

$$\frac{ \vdash \{P\} \, S_1 \, \{P'\} \qquad \vdash \{P'\} \, S_2 \, \{Q\}}{\vdash \{P\} \, S_1; \; S_2 \, \{Q\}} \; seq \quad \frac{\vdash \{P \wedge b\} S_1 \{Q\}}{\vdash \{P\} \; \text{if b then S_1 else S_2 $\{Q\}$}} \; if$$

$$\frac{\vdash P' \Rightarrow P \qquad \qquad \vdash \{P\} \ S \ \{Q\} \qquad \qquad \vdash Q \Rightarrow Q'}{\vdash \{P'\} \ S \ \{Q'\}} \ consq$$

• Question: What should be the rule for while *b* do *S*?

Soundness and Completeness

```
• Sound: if \vdash \{P\}S\{Q\} then \models \{P\}S\{Q\}
```

```
• Complete: if \models \{P\}S\{Q\} then \vdash \{P\}S\{Q\}
```

Strongest Postconditions

Here are a number of valid Hoare Triples:

```
{x = 5} x := x * 2 { true }
{x = 5} x := x * 2 { x > 0 }
{x = 5} x := x * 2 { x = 10 | | x = 5 }
{x = 5} x := x * 2 { x = 10 }
```

Which one is best?

Strongest Postconditions

- Here are a number of valid Hoare Triples:
 - $\{x = 5\} x := x * 2 \{ true \}$
 - $\{x = 5\} \ x := x * 2 \{ x > 0 \}$
 - $\{x = 5\} \ x := x * 2 \{ x = 10 \mid | x = 5 \}$
 - $\{x = 5\} x := x * 2 \{x = 10\}$
 - All are true, but this one is the most useful
 - x=10 is the *strongest postcondition*
- If {P} S {Q} and for all Q' such that {P} S {Q'}, Q \Rightarrow Q', then Q is the strongest postcondition of S with respect to P
 - check: $x = 10 \Rightarrow true$
 - check: $x = 10 \Rightarrow x > 0$
 - check: $x = 10 \Rightarrow x = 10 \mid x = 5$
 - check: $x = 10 \Rightarrow x = 10$

Weakest Preconditions

Here are a number of valid Hoare Triples:

```
• \{x = 5 \&\& y = 10\} z := x / y \{z < 1\}
• \{x < y \&\& y > 0\} z := x / y \{z < 1\}
• \{y \ne 0 \&\& x / y < 1\} z := x / y \{z < 1\}
```

• Which one is best?

Weakest Preconditions

Here are a number of valid Hoare Triples:

```
• \{x = 5 \&\& y = 10\} z := x / y \{ z < 1 \}
```

- $\{x < y \&\& y > 0\}$ $z := x / y \{ z < 1 \}$
- $\{y \neq 0 \&\& x / y < 1\} z := x / y \{z < 1\}$
 - All are true, but this one is the most useful because it allows us to invoke the program in the most general condition
 - $y \ne 0 \&\& x / y < 1$ is the weakest precondition
- If {P} S {Q} and for all P' such that {P'} S {Q}, P' ⇒ P, then P is the weakest precondition wp(S,Q) of S with respect to Q

Hoare Triples and Weakest Preconditions

- Theorem: {P} S {Q} holds if and only if $P \Rightarrow wp(S,Q)$
 - In other words, a Hoare Triple is still valid if the precondition is stronger than necessary, but not if it is too weak
 - Can use this to prove {P} S {Q} by computing wp(S,Q) and checking implication.
- Question: Could we state a similar theorem for a strongest postcondition function?
 - e.g. {P} S {Q} holds if and only if $sp(S,P) \Rightarrow Q$
 - A: Yes, but it's harder to compute (see text for why)



Exercise: More Hoare Triples

Consider the following Hoare triples:

```
    A) { z = y + 1 } x := z * 2 { x = 4 }
    B) { y = 7 } x := y + 3 { x > 5 }
    C) { false } x := 2 / y { true }
    D) { y < 16 } x := y / 2 { x < 8 }</li>
```

- Which of the Hoare triples above are valid?
- Considering the valid Hoare triples, for which ones can you write a stronger postcondition? (Leave the precondition unchanged, and ensure the resulting triple is still valid)
- Considering the valid Hoare triples, for which ones can you write a weaker precondition? (Leave the postcondition unchanged, and ensure the resulting triple is still valid)

- Assignment
 - $\{P\} x := 3 \{x+y > 0\}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?

- Assignment
 - $\{P\} x := 3 \{x+y > 0\}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?
 - What is most general value of y such that 3 + y > 0?
 - y > -3

- Assignment
 - $\{P\} x := 3 \{x+y > 0\}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?
- Assignment rule
 - wp(x := e, P) = [e/x] P
 - Resulting triple: { [e/x] P } x := e { P }

- Assignment
 - $\{P\} x := 3 \{x+y > 0\}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?
- Assignment rule
 - wp(x := e, P) = [e/x] P
 - Resulting triple: { [e/x] P } x := e { P }
 - [3/x](x + y > 0)
 - $\bullet = (3) + y > 0$
 - = y > -3

- Assignment
 - $\{P\} x := 3*y + z \{x * y z > 0\}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?

- Assignment
 - $\{P\} x := 3*y + z \{x * y z > 0\}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?
- Assignment rule
 - wp(x := e, P) = [e/x] P

- Assignment
 - $\{P\} x := 3*y + z \{x * y z > 0\}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?
- Assignment rule
 - wp(x := e, P) = [e/x] P
 - [3*y+z/x](x*y-z>0)

- Assignment
 - $\{P\} x := 3*y + z \{x * y z > 0\}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?
- Assignment rule
 - wp(x := e, P) = [e/x] P
 - [3*y+z/x](x*y-z>0)
 - = (3*y+z)*y-z>0

- Assignment
 - $\{P\} x := 3*y + z \{x * y z > 0\}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?
- Assignment rule
 - wp(x := e, P) = [e/x] P
 - [3*y+z/x](x*y-z>0)
 - = (3*y+z) * y z > 0
 - = $3*y^2 + z*y z > 0$

- Sequence
 - $\{P\} x := x + 1; y := x + y \{y > 5\}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?

- Sequence
 - $\{P\} x := x + 1; y := x + y \{y > 5\}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?
- Sequence rule
 - wp(S;T,Q) = wp(S,wp(T,Q))
 - wp(x:=x+1; y:=x+y, y>5)

- Sequence
 - $\{P\} x := x + 1; y := x + y \{y > 5\}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?
- Sequence rule
 - wp(S;T,Q) = wp(S,wp(T,Q))
 - wp(x:=x+1; y:=x+y, y>5)
 - = wp(x:=x+1, wp(y:=x+y, y>5))

- Sequence
 - $\{P\} x := x + 1; y := x + y \{y > 5\}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?
- Sequence rule
 - wp(S;T,Q) = wp(S,wp(T,Q))
 - wp(x:=x+1; y:=x+y, y>5)
 - = wp(x:=x+1, wp(y:=x+y, y>5))
 - = wp(x:=x+1, x+y>5)

- Sequence
 - $\{P\} x := x + 1; y := x + y \{y > 5\}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?
- Sequence rule
 - wp(S;T,Q) = wp(S,wp(T,Q))
 - wp(x:=x+1; y:=x+y, y>5)
 - = wp(x:=x+1, wp(y:=x+y, y>5))
 - = wp(x:=x+1, x+y>5)
 - = x+1+y>5

- Sequence
 - $\{P\} x := x + 1; y := x + y \{y > 5\}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?
- Sequence rule
 - wp(S;T,Q) = wp(S,wp(T,Q))
 - wp(x:=x+1; y:=x+y, y>5)
 - = wp(x:=x+1, wp(y:=x+y, y>5))
 - = wp(x:=x+1, x+y>5)
 - = x+1+y>5
 - = x+y>4

- Conditional
 - { P } if x > 0 then y := z else $y := -z \{ y > 5 \}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?

- Conditional
 - { P } if x > 0 then y := z else $y := -z \{ y > 5 \}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?
- Conditional rule
 - $wp(if B then S else T, Q) = B \Rightarrow wp(S,Q) \&\& \neg B \Rightarrow wp(T,Q)$
 - wp(if x>0 then y:=z else y:=-z, y>5)

- Conditional
 - { P } if x > 0 then y := z else $y := -z \{ y > 5 \}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?
- Conditional rule
 - $wp(if B then S else T, Q) = B \Rightarrow wp(S,Q) \&\& \neg B \Rightarrow wp(T,Q)$
 - $wp(if x>0 then y:=z else y:=-z, y>5) = x>0 \Rightarrow wp(y:=z,y>5) && x \le 0 \Rightarrow wp(y:=-z,y>5)$

- Conditional
 - { P } if x > 0 then y := z else $y := -z \{ y > 5 \}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?
- Conditional rule
 - $wp(if B then S else T, Q) = B \Rightarrow wp(S,Q) \&\& \neg B \Rightarrow wp(T,Q)$
 - wp(if x>0 then y:=z else y:=-z, y>5) = x>0 \Rightarrow wp(y:=z,y>5) && x \leq 0 \Rightarrow wp(y:=-z,y>5)

$$= x>0 \Rightarrow z > 5 \&\& x \le 0 \Rightarrow -z > 5$$

- Conditional
 - { P } if x > 0 then y := z else $y := -z \{ y > 5 \}$
 - What is the weakest precondition P?
- Conditional rule
 - $wp(if B then S else T, Q) = B \Rightarrow wp(S,Q) \&\& \neg B \Rightarrow wp(T,Q)$
 - wp(if x>0 then y:=z else y:=-z, y>5) = x>0 \Rightarrow wp(y:=z,y>5) && x \leq 0 \Rightarrow wp(y:=-z,y>5)

$$= x>0 \Rightarrow z > 5 \&\& x \le 0 \Rightarrow -z > 5$$

$$= x>0 \Rightarrow z > 5 \&\& x \le 0 \Rightarrow z < -5$$

- Loops
 - { P } while (i < x) f=f*i; i := i + 1 { f = x! }
 - What is the weakest precondition P?

- Loops
 - { P } while (i < x) f=f*i; i := i + 1 { f = x! }
 - What is the weakest precondition P?
- Intuition
 - Must prove by induction
 - Only way to generalize across number of times loop executes
 - Need to guess induction hypothesis
 - Base case: precondition P
 - Inductive case: should be preserved by executing loop body

Proving loops correct

- First consider *partial correctness*
 - The loop may not terminate, but if it does, the postcondition will hold
- {P} while B do S {Q}
 - Find an invariant Inv such that:
 - P ⇒ Inv
 - The invariant is initially true
 - { Inv && B } S {Inv}
 - Each execution of the loop preserves the invariant
 - (Inv && $\neg B$) \Rightarrow Q
 - The invariant and the loop exit condition imply the postcondition

Practice: Loop Invariants

Consider the following program:

```
{ N >= 0 }
i := 0;
while (i < N) do
i := N
{ i = N }
```

Correctness Conditions

```
P ⇒ Inv

The invariant is initially true
{ Inv && B } S {Inv}

Loop preserves the invariant
(Inv && ¬B) ⇒ Q

Invariant and exit implies
postcondition
```

Which of the following loop invariants are correct? For those that are incorrect, explain why.

- A) i = 0
- B) i = N

• Prove array sum correct $\{ N \geq 0 \}$ j := 0; s := 0;while (j < N) do j := j + 1;s := s + a[j];end $\{ s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le N \cdot a[i]) \}$

```
• Prove array sum correct
\{ N \geq 0 \}
j := 0;
s := 0;
while (j < N) do
  j := j + 1;
  s := s + a[j];
end
\{ s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le N \cdot a[i]) \}
```

How can we find a loop invariant?

 Prove array sum correct $\{ N \geq 0 \}$ j := 0;s := 0;How can we find a loop invariant? while (j < N) do j := j + 1;Replace N with j Add information on range of j s := s + a[j];Result: $0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \bullet a[i])$ end

 $\{s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le N \cdot a[i])\}$

 Prove array sum correct $\{ N \ge 0 \}$ j := 0;s := 0; $\{ 0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \}$ while (j < N) do $\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j < N\}$ j := j + 1;s := s + a[j]; $\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i])\}$ end $\{ s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le N \cdot a[i]) \}$

```
    Prove array sum correct

\{ N \geq 0 \}
                                                     -Proof obligation #1
j := 0;
s := 0;
\{ 0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \}
while (j < N) do
  \{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j < N\}
  i := i + 1;
                                                                    -Proof obligation #2
  s := s + a[j];
end
\{ s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le N \cdot a[i]) \}
```

Invariant is initially true

```
\{ N \ge 0 \}

j := 0;

s := 0;

\{ 0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \}
```

Invariant is initially true
{ N ≥ 0 }
j := 0;
s := 0;
{ 0 ≤ j ≤ N && s = (Σi | 0≤i<j • a[i]) }
Invariant is maintained
{ 0 ≤ j ≤ N && s = (Σi | 0≤i<j • a[i]) && j < N}
j := j + 1;
s := s + a[j];
{ 0 ≤ j ≤ N && s = (Σi | 0≤i<j • a[i]) }

 Invariant is initially true $\{ N \geq 0 \}$ i := 0;s := 0; $\{ 0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \}$ Invariant is maintained $\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j < N\}$ i := i + 1;s := s + a[i]; $\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i])\}$ Invariant and exit condition imply postcondition $0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j \ge N$ \Rightarrow s = ($\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le N \cdot a[i]$)

• Invariant is initially true

```
\{ N \ge 0 \}

j := 0;

s := 0;

\{ 0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \}
```

Invariant is initially true

Invariant is initially true

```
 \{ \ N \ge 0 \}   \{ \ 0 \le \mathbf{0} \le \mathbb{N} \ \&\& \ 0 = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < \mathbf{0} \cdot a[i]) \}  // by assignment rule  j := 0;   \{ \ 0 \le j \le \mathbb{N} \ \&\& \ \mathbf{0} = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \}  // by assignment rule  s := 0;   \{ \ 0 \le j \le \mathbb{N} \ \&\& \ s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \}
```

Invariant is initially true

```
\{ \ N \ge 0 \}

\{ \ 0 \le \mathbf{0} \le \mathbb{N} \ \&\& \ 0 = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < \mathbf{0} \cdot a[i]) \} // by assignment rule j := 0;

\{ \ 0 \le j \le \mathbb{N} \ \&\& \ \mathbf{0} = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \} // by assignment rule s := 0;

\{ \ 0 \le j \le \mathbb{N} \ \&\& \ s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \}
```

$$(N \ge 0) \Rightarrow (0 \le 0 \le N \&\& 0 = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < 0 \cdot a[i]))$$

Invariant is initially true

```
\{ \ N \ge 0 \}

\{ \ 0 \le \mathbf{0} \le \mathbb{N} \ \&\& \ 0 = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < \mathbf{0} \cdot a[i]) \} // by assignment rule j := 0;

\{ \ 0 \le j \le \mathbb{N} \ \&\& \ \mathbf{0} = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \} // by assignment rule s := 0;

\{ \ 0 \le j \le \mathbb{N} \ \&\& \ s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \}
```

```
(N \ge 0) \Rightarrow (0 \le 0 \le N \&\& 0 = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < 0 \bullet a[i]))
= (N \ge 0) \Rightarrow (0 \le N \&\& 0 = \mathbf{0})  // 0 \le 0 is true, empty sum is 0
```

Invariant is initially true

```
\{ N \ge 0 \}

\{ 0 \le \mathbf{0} \le N \&\& 0 = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < \mathbf{0} \cdot a[i]) \} // by assignment rule j := 0;

\{ 0 \le j \le N \&\& \mathbf{0} = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \} // by assignment rule s := 0;

\{ 0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \}
```

```
(N \ge 0) \Rightarrow (0 \le 0 \le N \&\& 0 = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < 0 \bullet a[i]))
= (N \ge 0) \Rightarrow (0 \le N \&\& 0 = \mathbf{0})  // 0 \le 0 is true, empty sum is 0 = (N \ge 0) \Rightarrow (0 \le N)  // 0 = 0 is true, P \&\& true is P
```

Invariant is initially true

```
 \{ \ N \ge 0 \}   \{ \ 0 \le \mathbf{0} \le N \ \&\& \ 0 = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < \mathbf{0} \cdot a[i]) \}  // by assignment rule  j := 0;   \{ \ 0 \le j \le N \ \&\& \ \mathbf{0} = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \}  // by assignment rule  s := 0;   \{ \ 0 \le j \le N \ \&\& \ s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \}
```

```
(N \ge 0) \Rightarrow (0 \le 0 \le N \&\& 0 = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < 0 \bullet a[i]))
= (N \ge 0) \Rightarrow (0 \le N \&\& 0 = \mathbf{0})  // 0 \le 0 is true, empty sum is 0 = (N \ge 0) \Rightarrow (0 \le N)  // 0 = 0 is true, P \&\& true is P = \mathbf{true}
```

```
\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j < N\}
j := j + 1;
s := s + a[j];
\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \}
```

```
\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j < N\}
j := j + 1;
\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s + a[j] = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i])\} // by assignment rule s := s + a[j];
\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i])\}
```

```
\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j < N\}
\{0 \le j + 1 \le N \&\& s + a[j + 1] = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j + 1 \cdot a[i])\} // by assignment rule j := j + 1;
\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s + a[j] = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i])\} // by assignment rule s := s + a[j];
\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i])\}
```

```
\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j < N\}
   \{0 \le j + 1 \le N \&\& s + a[j+1] = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j+1 \cdot a[i])\} // by assignment rule
   i := i + 1;
   \{0 \le j \le N \&\& s+a[j] = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i])\} // by assignment rule
   s := s + a[j];
   \{0 \le i \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < i \bullet a[i]) \}

    Need to show that:

   (0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j < N)
              \Rightarrow (0 \le j +1 \le N && s+a[j+1] = (\Si \ 0 \le i \le j+1 \ \cdot a[i]))
= (0 \le i \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le i \bullet a[i]))
              \Rightarrow (-1 \leq j < N && s+a[j+1] = (\Sigmai | 0 \leqi<j+1 • a[i])) // simplify bounds of j
= (0 \le i \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le j \cdot a[i]))
              \Rightarrow (-1 \leq j < N && s+a[j+1] = (\Sigmai | 0\leqi<j • a[i]) + a[j]) // separate last element
```

 Invariant is maintained $\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j < N\}$ $\{0 \le j + 1 \le N \&\& s + a[j+1] = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j+1 \cdot a[i])\}$ // by assignment rule i := i + 1; $\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s+a[j] = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i])\}$ // by assignment rule s := s + a[i]; $\{0 \le i \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < i \bullet a[i]) \}$ Need to show that: $(0 \le i \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j < N)$ \Rightarrow (0 ≤ j +1 ≤ N && s+a[j+1] = (Σi | 0≤i<j+1 • a[i])) = $(0 \le i \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le i \bullet a[i]))$ \Rightarrow (-1 \leq j < N && s+a[j+1] = (Σ i | $0 \leq$ i<j+1 • a[i])) // simplify bounds of j = $(0 \le i \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le j \cdot a[i]))$ \Rightarrow (-1 \leq j < N && s+a[j+1] = (Σ i | 0 \leq i<j • a[i]) + **a[j]**) // separate last element

// we have a problem - we need a[j+1] and a[j] to cancel out

Where's the error?

• Prove array sum correct $\{ N \geq 0 \}$ j := 0; s := 0;while (j < N) do j := j + 1;s := s + a[j];end $\{ s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < N \cdot a[i]) \}$

Where's the error?

```
• Prove array sum correct
\{ N \geq 0 \}
j := 0;
s := 0;
while (j < N) do
                                        Need to add element
                                        before incrementing j
  j := j + 1;
  s := s + a[j];
end
\{ s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le N \cdot a[i]) \}
```

Corrected Code

• Prove array sum correct $\{ N \geq 0 \}$ j := 0; s := 0;while (j < N) do s := s + a[j];j := j + 1;end $\{ s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < N \cdot a[i]) \}$

```
\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \bullet a[i]) \&\& j < N\}
s := s + a[j];
j := j + 1;
\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \bullet a[i]) \}
```

Invariant is maintained

```
\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j < N\}

s := s + a[j];

\{0 \le j + 1 \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j + 1 \cdot a[i])\}

j := j + 1;

\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i])\}
```

// by assignment rule

```
\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j < N\}

\{0 \le j + 1 \le N \&\& s + a[j] = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j + 1 \cdot a[i]) \} // by assignment rule

s := s + a[j];

\{0 \le j + 1 \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j + 1 \cdot a[i]) \} // by assignment rule

j := j + 1;

\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \}
```

Invariant is maintained

Invariant is maintained

```
\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j < N\}
   \{0 \le j + 1 \le N \&\& s + a[j] = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j + 1 \cdot a[i]) \} // by assignment rule
   s := s + a[j];
   \{0 \le \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{1} \le \mathbb{N} \&\& s = (\Sigma \mathbf{i} \mid 0 \le \mathbf{i} < \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{1} \cdot a[\mathbf{i}])\}
                                                                                               // by assignment rule
   i := i + 1;
   \{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i])\}

    Need to show that:

   (0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j < N)
               \Rightarrow (0 \leq j +1 \leq N && s+a[j] = (\Sigmai | 0\leqi\leqj+1 • a[i]))
= (0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le j \cdot a[i]))
               \Rightarrow (-1 \leq j < N && s+a[j] = (\Sigmai | 0 \leqi<j+1 • a[i])) // simplify bounds of j
= (0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le j \cdot a[i]))
               \Rightarrow (-1 \leq j < N && s+a[j] = (\Sigmai | 0\leqi<j • a[i]) + a[j]) // separate last part of sum
```

Invariant is maintained

```
\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j < N\}
    \{0 \le j + 1 \le N \&\& s + a[j] = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j + 1 \cdot a[i])\} // by assignment rule
    s := s + a[j];
    \{0 \le j + 1 \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j + 1 \cdot a[i])\}
                                                                                                  // by assignment rule
   j := j + 1;
    \{0 \le i \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < i \cdot a[i])\}

    Need to show that:

    (0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j < N)
                \Rightarrow (0 \leq j +1 \leq N && s+a[j] = (\Sigmai | 0\leqi<j+1 • a[i]))
= (0 \le i \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le i \bullet a[i]))
                \Rightarrow (-1 \leq j < N && s+a[j] = (\Sigmai | 0 \leqi<j+1 • a[i])) // simplify bounds of j
= (0 \le i \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le i \bullet a[i]))
                \Rightarrow (-1 \leq j < N && s+a[j] = (\Sigmai | 0\leqi<j • a[i]) + a[j] ) // separate last part of sum
= (0 \le i \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le i \bullet a[i]))
                \Rightarrow (-1 \leq j < N && s = (\Sigmai | 0\leqi<j • a[i])) // subtract a[j] from both sides
```

 Invariant is maintained $\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j \le N\}$ $\{0 \le j + 1 \le N \&\& s + a[j] = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j + 1 \cdot a[i])\}$ // by assignment rule s := s + a[i]; $\{0 \le i + 1 \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < i + 1 \cdot a[i])\}$ // by assignment rule j := j + 1; $\{0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i])\}$ Need to show that: $(0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j < N)$ \Rightarrow (0 \le j +1 \le N && s+a[j] = (\(\Si\) | 0\le i \le j +1 \cdot a[i]\)) = $(0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le j \cdot a[i]))$ \Rightarrow (-1 \leq j < N && s+a[j] = (Σ i | $0 \leq$ i<j+1 • a[i])) // simplify bounds of j = $(0 \le i \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le i \bullet a[i]))$ \Rightarrow (-1 \leq j < N && s+a[j] = (Σ i | 0 \leq i<j • a[i]) + a[j]) // separate last part of sum = $(0 \le i \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le i \bullet a[i]))$ \Rightarrow (-1 \leq j \leq N && s = (Σ i | 0 \leq i \leq j • a[i])) // subtract a[j] from both sides

 $//0 \le j \Rightarrow -1 \le j$

= true

$$0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j \ge N$$

 $\Rightarrow s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < N \cdot a[i])$

```
0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j \ge N
\Rightarrow s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < N \cdot a[i])
= 0 \le j \&\& \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{N} \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i])
\Rightarrow s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < N \cdot a[i])
// because (j \le N \&\& j \ge N) = (j = N)
```

```
0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i]) \&\& j \ge N

\Rightarrow s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < N \cdot a[i])

= 0 \le j \&\& j = N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i])

\Rightarrow s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < N \cdot a[i])

= 0 \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < N \cdot a[i]) \Rightarrow s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < N \cdot a[i])

= 0 \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < N \cdot a[i]) \Rightarrow s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < N \cdot a[i])

= 0 \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < N \cdot a[i]) \Rightarrow s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < N \cdot a[i])
```

```
0 \le j \le N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \bullet a[i]) \&\& j \ge N
             \Rightarrow s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le N \cdot a[i])
= 0 \le i \&\& j = N \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < j \cdot a[i])
             \Rightarrow s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i \le N \cdot a[i])
                        // because (j \le N \&\& j \ge N) = (j = N)
= 0 \le \mathbb{N} \&\& s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < \mathbb{N} \cdot a[i]) \Rightarrow s = (\Sigma i \mid 0 \le i < \mathbb{N} \cdot a[i])
                        // by substituting N for j, since j = N
= true // because P \&\& Q \Rightarrow Q
```



Practice: Writing Proof Obligations

• For the program below and the invariant i <= N, write the proof obligations. The form of your answer should be three mathematical implications.

```
{ N >= 0 }

i := 0;

while (i < N) do

i := N

{ i = N }
```

- Invariant is initially true:
- Invariant is preserved by the loop body:

Invariant Intuition

- For code without loops, we are simulating execution directly
 - We prove one Hoare Triple for each statement, and each statement is executed once
- For code with loops, we are doing one proof of correctness for multiple loop iterations
 - Proof must cover all iterations
 - Don't know how many there will be
 - The invariant must be *general* yet *precise*
 - general enough to be true for every execution
 - precise enough to imply the postcondition we need
 - This tension makes inferring loop invariants challenging



Can we also formalize proof obligations?

- Yes, with verification condition generation
 - Bonus: we can get one formula for correctness of the whole program
- Dathar than commenting into coveral formulae that we prove

```
VCGen(\operatorname{skip}, Q) = VCGen(S_1; S_2, Q) = VCGen(\operatorname{if} b \operatorname{then} S_1 \operatorname{else} S_2, Q) = VCGen(x := e, Q) =
```

Can we also formalize proof obligations?

- Yes, with verification condition generation
 - Bonus: we can get one formula for correctness of the whole program
 - Dathar than commenting into coveral formulae that we prove

```
VCGen(\operatorname{skip},Q) = Q

VCGen(S_1;S_2,Q) = VCGen(S_1,VCGen(S_2,Q))

VCGen(\operatorname{if} b \operatorname{then} S_1 \operatorname{else} S_2,Q) = b \Rightarrow VCGen(S_1,Q) \land \neg b \Rightarrow VCGen(S_2,Q)

VCGen(x:=e,Q) = [e/x]Q
```

 $VCGen(\text{while}_{inv} \ e \ \text{do} \ S, Q) = Inv \land (\forall x_1...x_n.Inv \Rightarrow (e \Rightarrow VCGen(S, Inv) \land \neg e \Rightarrow Q))$



Verification Condition Generation - Summary & Future Lectures

- Verification Conditions make axiomatic semantics practical.
 - We can solve them automatically with SAT solvers
 - We can compute verification conditions forward for use on unstructured code (= assembly language). This is sometimes called symbolic execution.
- We can add extra invariants or drop paths (dropping is *unsound*) to help verification condition generation scale.
- We can model **exceptions**, **memory** operations and **data structures** using verification condition generation.

