

CS 839: Systems Verification

Lecture 8: Separation Logic (part 2)

this lecture will be mostly on the board

Learning outcomes

1. Appreciate why separation logic works
2. Be ready to think *in* separation logic

Recall: meaning of $P * Q$

Write down the definition from memory

Answer

$$(P * Q)(h) \triangleq \exists h_1, h_2. (h = h_1 \cup h_2) \wedge (h_1 \perp h_2) \wedge P(h_1) \wedge Q(h_2)$$

Recall: separation logic predicates

$$\ell_3 \mapsto \ell_4 * \ell_2 \mapsto \ell_2 * \ell_1 \mapsto 3$$

Separation logic rules

$$\{\text{emp}\} \text{ alloc } v \{ \lambda w. \exists \ell. [w = \ell] \star \ell \mapsto v \} \text{ alloc-spec}$$
$$\{\ell \mapsto v\} !\ell \{ \lambda w. [w = v] \star \ell \mapsto v \} \text{ load-spec}$$
$$\{\ell \mapsto v_0\} \ell \leftarrow v \{ \lambda _. \ell \mapsto v \} \text{ store-spec}$$

Now we get to the *program* logic part of separation logic, reasoning about actual programs.

Frame rule

$$\frac{\{P\} e \{\lambda v. Q(v)\}}{\{P \star F\} e \{\lambda v. Q(v) \star F\}} \text{ frame}$$

Key to separation logic

Recall how in regular Hoare logic, we would prove a specification for a function, then use it whenever needed by adapting the pre- and post-condition with the rule of consequence.

The frame rule lets us reason about a function over a "small footprint" and then use it in a larger heap. It shows that in the larger context, the function doesn't modify "anything else."

Illustrative example of framing

suppose we've proven

$\{\ell_1 \mapsto \bar{0}\} f(\ell_1, \ell_2) \{\ell_1 \mapsto \bar{42}\}$

$e_{\text{own}} ::=$

```
let  $x := \text{alloc } \bar{0}$  in  
let  $y := \text{alloc } \bar{42}$  in  
 $f(x, y);$   
assert ( $!x == !y$ )
```


Proof outline for e_{own}

Rewrite the code (in "A-normal form") to put !x and !y onto their own lines, so the proof outline can be written clearly.

Exercise: prove swap correct

$\text{swap } \ell_1 \ell_2 ::= \text{let } t := !\ell_1 \text{ in } \ell_1 \leftarrow !\ell_2; \ell_2 \leftarrow t$

$\{x \mapsto a \star y \mapsto b\}$

$\text{swap } x y$

$\{\lambda_. x \mapsto b \star y \mapsto a\}$

5-min break

Magic wand

$$P \multimap Q$$

There is another separation logic operator that turns out to be useful to mechanize proofs in Rocq: the "magic wand", or more formally the "separating implication".

Intuition for magic wand

If you remember only one thing about wand, remember $P \star (P \multimap Q) \vdash Q$.

Consider the Prop equivalent to get a sense for this as a form of implication, but with separating conjunction rather than regular conjunction

Characterization of magic wand

$$P \vdash (Q \multimap R) \iff P \star Q \vdash R$$

Exercise: defining magic wand in the model

"if we extend the heap with P, then we get Q"

Answer

$$(P \multimap Q)(h) \triangleq \forall h', (h \perp h') \wedge P(h') \implies Q(h \cup h')$$

Properties of wand

$$\frac{}{P \star (P \multimap Q) \vdash Q} \text{ wand-elim}$$

$$\frac{P \star Q \vdash R}{P \vdash (Q \multimap R)} \text{ wand-intro}$$

Wand implication

$$\frac{P' \vdash P \quad Q \vdash Q'}{(P \multimap Q) \vdash (P' \multimap Q')} \text{ wand-impl}$$

Extracting from an array

Application 1: single element of an array

If we had `array(l, xs)` meaning a sequence of consecutive points-to facts, we could prove `array(l, xs) -* l |-> x[n] * (l + n |-> x[n] -* array(l, xs))` (if `n` is in-bounds!). More fancy: prove `array(l, xs) -* l |-> x[n] * (forall v, l + n |-> v -* array(l, <|n := v>| xs))`

Extracting from a HashMap

Rust Entry API

✓ `impl<'a, K, V> Entry<'a, K, V>`

[Source](#)

✓ `pub fn or_insert(self, default: V) -> &'a mut V`

1.0.0 · [Source](#)

Ensures a value is in the entry by inserting the default if empty, and returns a mutable reference to the value in the entry.

Examples

```
use std::collections::HashMap;

let mut map: HashMap<&str, u32> = HashMap::new();

map.entry("ponyland").or_insert(3);
assert_eq!(map["ponyland"], 3);

*map.entry("ponyland").or_insert(10) *= 2;
assert_eq!(map["ponyland"], 6);
```