# Programming and Hoare Logic COMP SCI 2LC3

### Ryszard Janicki

Department of Computing and Software, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

### Introduction

- We discuss some applications of predicate logic in computing:
  - 1 the formal specification of imperative programs
  - 4 the proof and development of sequences of assignments
  - the calculation of parts of assignments (to avoid guess)
- We discuss the conditional statement and conditional expression

- Execution of the assignment statement x := E evaluates expression E and stores the result in variable x
- Assignment x := E is read as "x becomes E"
- Execution of x := E in a state stores in x the value of E in that state

### Example

Suppose the state s = (v, w, x) = (5, 4, 8). Consider the assignment v := v + w

The value of v + w in the state is 9, so executing v := v + w stores 9 in v, changing the state to s' = (9, 4, 8).



- A precondition of a statement is an assertion about the program variables in a state in which the statement may be executed
- A postcondition is an assertion about the states in which it may terminate

#### Example

Suppose the state s = (v, w, x) = (5, 4, 8). Consider the assignment v := v + w

- The precondition could be  $v=5 \ \land \ w=4 \ \land \ x=2w$
- The postcondition could be  $v' = v + w \wedge w' = w \wedge x' = x$



### Some important questions:

- From a precondition for an assignment, how can we determine a corresponding postcondition?
- From a postcondition, can we determine a suitable precondition?

The conventional way of indicating a precondition and a postcondition for a statement S is  $\{P\}$  S  $\{Q\}$  where

- P is the precondition
- Q is the postcondition

 $\{P\} S \{Q\}$  is known as a Hoare triple



• {Q} S {R} has the interpretation

Execution of S begun in any state in which Q is true is guaranteed to terminate, and R is true in the final state.

- $\{\text{true}\}\ S\ \{x=y\}$  says that the execution of S begun in any state is guaranteed to terminate at a state satisfying x=y
- If precondition Q is false, then the Hoare-triple guarantees nothing about execution, so execution of S can do anything!

### Example

- $\{x = 0\}$  x := x + 1  $\{x > 0\}$  is a Hoare triple that is valid iff execution of x := x + 1 in any state in which x = 0 terminates in a state in which x > 0
- $\{x > 5\} \ x := x + 1 \ \{x > 0\}$

VALID

•  $\{x+1>0\}$  x:=x+1  $\{x>0\}$ 

**VALID** 

•  $\{x = 5\} \ x := x + 1 \ \{x = 7\}$ 

**NOT VALID** 

### Definition (Assignment)

$${R[x := E]} x := E {R}$$

#### Example

- $\{5 \neq 5\} \ x := 5 \ \{x \neq 5\}$
- $\{x^2 > x^2 \cdot y\} \ x := x^2 \ \{x > x \cdot y\}$

Note that R and R[x:=E] are exactly the same except that where R has an occurrence of x while R[x:=E] has an occurrence of "E"



- In some programming languages, the assignment statement is extended to the multiple assignment
  - $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n := E_1, E_2, \dots, E_n$ , where the  $x_i$  are distinct variables and the  $E_i$  are expressions
- The multiple assignment is executed as follows:
  - Evaluate all the expressions  $E_i$  to obtain a value  $v_i$
  - 2 Assign  $v_i$  to  $x_i, \dots$ , and finally  $v_n$  to  $x_n$ .
- Note that all expressions are evaluated before any assignments are performed

### Example

- $\bullet$  x, y := y, x
- x, i := 0, 0
- $\bullet$  x, i := x + 1, i + 1
- i, x := i + 1, x + 1
- x, y := x + y, x + y
- $\bullet \ x := x + y; \ y := x + y$

- Multiple assignment is defined in terms of simultaneous textual substitution
- $\{R[x,y := E,F]\}\ x,y := E,F\ \{R\}$
- $\bullet \{R[y := F][x := E]\} x := E; y := F\{R\}$

### Example

 $\bullet \{y > x\} x, y := y, x \{x > y\}$ 

### Problem (and Solution)

- { ? }  $x, i := x + i, i + 1 \{x = 1 + 2 + \dots + (i 1)\}$ ?  $is x + i = 1 + 2 + \dots + (i + 1 - 1)$
- { ? }  $i,x := i+1, x+i \{x = 1+2+\cdots+(i-1)\}$ ?  $is x+i=1+2+\cdots+(i+1-1)$



### Example

- **1**  $\{ true \} x := 2 \{ true \}$
- **3**  $\{\text{true}\}\ x, y := 1, 2 \{\text{true}\}\$
- $\{false\} x, y := 1, 2 \{false\}$
- $\{(x-1)^2 + 2(x-1) = 3\} \ x := x-1 \ \{x^2 + 2x = 3\}, \text{ or } \{x^2 = 4\} \ x := x-1 \ \{x^2 + 2x = 3\}$
- $\{((x-1)+1)((x-1)-1)=0\} \ x := x-1 \ \{(x+1)(x-1)=0\}, \text{ or } \{x(x-2)=0\} \ x := x-1 \ \{(x+1)(x-1)=0\}$

12/41

A specification of a program should give:

- $\bigcirc$  a precondition Q
- ② a list x of variables that may be assigned to
- $\odot$  a postcondition R

We denote such a specification by  $\{Q\} x := ? \{R\}$ 

### Example

- $\{\text{true}\}\ x := ? \{x^2 = 9\}$
- $\{x < 0\} x := ? \{x > 0\}$

- A specification can be non-deterministic
- {true}  $b := ? \{b^2 = 25\}$  specifies a program that in any initial state stores a value in b so that  $b^2 = 25$
- A program that satisfies this specification can assign either
   -5 or 5 to b
- To formalize an English description of a program we have to define a precondition and a postcondition
- Some of the restrictions are implicit in the English specification ( we may have to invent variables)



- Consider the following English specification:
   Find an integer approximation to the square root of integer
   n.
- It is implicit that  $0 \le n$
- The integer approximation has to be stored in some variable (we call it d)
- We must precisely define what is acceptable as an approximation
- We have derived the formal specification

$$\{0 \le n\} \ d := ? \{d^2 \le n < (d+1)^2\}$$



We want to specify a program that finds the index of a value x in an array  $b[0, \dots, n-1]$ 

- Informal specification: "Find x in b"
- A precise definition must give conditions on b and n
  - Can the array segment be empty (n = 0)?
  - How should the index of x in b be indicated?
  - Can we assume that x is actually in the array segment?
  - If not, how should its absence be indicated?

### Formal specification: Four acceptable specifications

② 
$$\{0 \le n\} \ i := ? \{(0 \le i < n \land x = b[i]) \lor (i = n \land x \notin b[0, \dots, n-1]) \}$$

**③** {0 ≤ n} 
$$i := ?$$
 {(0 ≤  $i < n \land x \notin b[0, \dots, i-1]$ )  $\land (x = b[i] \lor i = n)$ }



- One can replace  $x \in b[0, \dots, n-1]$  by  $\exists (k \mid 0 \le k < n : x = b[k])$
- There may be many ways to formalize an English specification
- It takes experience, thought, and care to be able to do it well
- Developing a clear and rigorous (if not formal) specification is an important part of programming
- The more complicated the problem being tackled, the more important are good specifications



• We defined the (multiple) assignment x := E by

$${R[x := E]} x := E {R}$$

Assumption: E is total

- Many expressions are not total
- For each expression E, we define the predicate dom (E) to be satisfied in exactly those states in which E is defined

### Example

$$\mathsf{dom}\,(\sqrt{\frac{x}{y}})\iff y\neq 0 \ \land \ \tfrac{x}{y}\geq 0$$



• We can use different definitions of dom for different purposes

#### Example

$$x = x + y$$

here 
$$E$$
 is  $x + y$ 

- When first writing a program, we assume that  $\mathbb{Z}$  contains all the integers and write  $dom(x + y) \iff true$
- $\bullet$  To prove that no overflow occurs on a computer whose range of integers is  $-2^{16}+1\cdots 2^{16}-1$

$$dom(x + y) \iff -2^{16} < x + y < 2^{16}$$

More general definition of assignment:

$$\{ dom(E) \land R[x := E] \} x := E \{ R \}$$



# Reasoning about the assignment statement $(Proofs of \{Q\}) \times := E(R)$

- We claim that R[x := E] is the weakest precondition
- Another precondition Q satisfies  $\{Q\} x := E\{R\}$  if and only if  $Q \Longrightarrow R[x := E]$  holds

### Assignment introduction (proof method):

To show that x := E is an implementation of  $\{Q\} \times := ? \{R\}$ , prove

$$Q \implies R[x := E]$$

### Example

Specification	Implementation
${x > 0} x := {x > 1}$	x := x+1
Let P be	
$0 \le i \le n \land$	
$x = +(k \mid 0 \le k < i : b[k])$	
$\{P \land I = i \neq n\} \ x, i := ?$	x, i := x + b[i], i + 1
$\{P \land i = I+1\}$	

 Suppose we want to find the weakest precondition such that execution of a sequence x := E; y := F of assignments will terminate with R true:

$$\{?\} x := E; y := F \{R\}$$

We know how to find the weakest precondition for one assignment

#### Example

- ②  $\{?\} x := E; \{R[y := F]\} y := F \{R\}$

#### Generalisation:

$$\{R[x_n := E_n] \cdots [x_2 := E_2][x_1 := E_1]\}$$
  
 $x_1 := E_1; x_2 := E_2; \cdots x_n := E_n$   
 $\{R\}$ 



#### Example

- Find the weakest precondition such that execution of t := x; x := y; y := t leads to state that satisfies  $x = X \land y = Y$
- Calculate and simplify the weakest precondition for the following (where x and y are integers)

$$\{?\} x := x + y; y := x - y; x := x - y \{x = X \land y = Y\}$$

#### Problem

Define a predicate perm(b, c, n) that means: array segment  $b[O \cdots n-1]$  is a permutation of array segment  $c[O \cdots n-1]$ . (One array segment is a permutation of another if its values can be interchanged (swapped) so the two segments are equal. For example, (3,5,2,5) is a permutation of (2,3,5,5).



# Calculating parts of assignments

Consider maintaining

$$P_1 : x = +(k \mid 0 \le k < i : b[k])$$

using an assignment i, x := i + 1, e, where we assume that e is unknown

- How e can be calculated, instead of guessed?
  - Hoare triple:  $\{P_1\} i, x := i + 1, e \{P_1\}$
  - ullet Hoare triple is valid when  $P_1 \implies P_1[i,x := i+1,e]$

# Calculating parts of assignments - a proof

#### Proof.

# Calculating parts of assignments

#### Problem

- Consider solving for e in  $\{P_2 : x = +(k \mid i \leq k < n : b[k])\}\ i,x := i-1,e\ \{P_2\}\$  (see page 186 of Gries-Schneider for a solution)
- ② Suppose the number of apples that Mary and John have (represented by m and j, respectively) are related by the formula (C is some constant) P: C = m+2j. Find a solution for e in  $\{P \land \text{even}(m)\}\ m,j := m/2,e\ \{P\}$ .

The conditional statement, call it IF, has the following form

IF: if B then 
$$S_1$$
 else  $S_2$ ,

- B is a boolean expression
- $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are statements
- We can annotate IF to illustrate the execution of IF.

```
\{Q\} if B then \{Q \land B\} S_1 \{R\} else \{Q \land \neg B\} S_2 \{R\} \{R\}
```

Proof method for IF.: To prove  $\{Q\}$  IF  $\{R\}$ , it suffices to prove

- - ullet The statement  $S_2$  can be a skip (it does nothing)
  - skip satisfies {R} skip {R}

#### Example

To prove

```
\{\text{true}\}\ if x \le y then skip else x, y := y, x \{x \le y\}
```

we prove the following,

- **2** {true  $\land \neg (x \le y)$ }  $x, y := y, x \{x \le y\}$

• The statement if B then  $S_1$  else  $S_2$  can be written in the notation of guarded commands as the alternative statement:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{if} & B \longrightarrow S_1 \\
& \neg B \longrightarrow S_2 \\
\text{fi} & 
\end{array}$$

 In the guarded command notation, an alternative statement can be written with more than two possible choices

IFG: if 
$$B_1 \longrightarrow S_1$$

$$[] B_2 \longrightarrow S_2$$

$$[] B_3 \longrightarrow S_3$$
fi

There are two key points with the alternative statement.

- Execution aborts if no guard is true
- If more than one guard is true, only one of them is chosen (arbitrarily) and its corresponding command is executed.

Proof method for IFG: To prove  $\{Q\}$  IFG  $\{R\}$ , it suffices to prove:

- $Q \implies B_1 \vee B_2 \vee B_3$
- **2**  $\{Q \land B_1\} S_1 \{R\}$

### Example

Prove or disprove  $\{\neg(x > y \lor w > x)\}\ S\ \{w \le x \le y \le z\}$ .

#### Problem

Prove that the following annotated program is correct.



### Loops

Proof method for IF.: To prove  $\{Q\}$  while B do S od  $\{\neg B \land Q\}$ , it suffices to prove

$${Q \land B} S {Q}.$$

### Example

To prove

$$\{x \le 10\}$$
  
while  $x < 10$  do  $x := x + 1$  od  $\{\neg(x < 10) \land x \le 10\}$ 

we prove the following,

- $\{x \le 10 \land x < 10\} \ x := x + 1 \ \{x \le 10\}$ , or simplified
- $\{x < 10\} \ x : +x + 1 \ \{x \le 10\},\$

which is easily obtained by the assignment rule. Finally, the postcondition  $\{\neg(x<10)\land x\leq 10\}$  can be simplified to  $\{x=10\}$ .



36 / 41

### Loops

- Finding loop invariants is difficult! It involves induction
- We will discuss this problem later.



The following inference rules create so called 'Hoare Logic'

Empty statement

$$\overline{\{P\}}$$
 skip  $\{P\}$ 

Assignment

$$\overline{\{P[x:=E]\}\ x:=E\ \{P\}}$$

Composition

$$\frac{\{P\} \ S \ \{Q\} \ , \ \{Q\} \ T \ \{R\}}{\{P\} \ S; T \ \{R\}}$$

• if-then-else

$$\frac{\{B \land P\} \ S \ \{Q\} \ , \ \{\neg B \land P\} \ T \ \{Q\}}{\{P\} \ \text{if} \ B \ \text{then} \ S \ \text{else} \ T \ \{Q\}}$$

while-do

$$\frac{P \land B}{\{P\} \text{ while } B \text{ do } S \text{ od } \{\neg B \land P\}}$$

Consequence (often omitted)

$$\frac{P_1 \implies P_2 , \{P_2\} S \{Q_2\} , Q_2 \implies Q_1}{\{P_1\} S \{Q_1\}}$$

Finding **loop invariants** is the most complicated task! In general we cannot calculate them! We have to guess them (induction!).

 Sometimes {Q} while B do S od {R} can be proven for (almost) arbitrary Q and R!

```
Example \{P \land x = 0\} while i \le 4 do x := x + 1; S od \{R\} \iff \{P \land x = 0\} x := x + 1; S; x := x + 1; S \{R\}
```

• For each constant n, we can prove

for 
$$i = 1$$
 to  $n$  do  $S$  od

by unfolding for and using composition inference rule n-1 times.

#### Example

$$\{Q\}$$
 for  $i = 1$  to 4 do  $S$  od  $\{R\}$ 

 $\iff$ 

$$\{Q\}$$
 S; S; S; S  $\{Q\}$ 

Similarly for

for 
$$i = 1$$
 to  $10^{10^{10}}$  do  $S$  od.

one just needs to use composition  $10^{10^{10}} - 1$  times.

