

# CS4004/CS4504: FORMAL VERIFICATION

## Lecture 13: Hoare Logic

---

Vasileios Koutavas



School of Computer Science and Statistics  
Trinity College Dublin

**Goal:** Software without bugs.

We have seen:

- how to reason about mathematical properties in First-Order Logic (FOL)

**Goal:** Software without bugs.

We have seen:

- how to reason about mathematical properties in First-Order Logic (FOL)

From now on:

- how to reason about simple **imperative programs**
  - FOL for specifications
- how to reason about properties (e.g., termination) of recursive functional programs using:
  - FOL natural deduction proofs
  - Well-founded induction
  - Case analysis on data types (natural numbers, lists, etc.)
  - variants (when reasoning about termination)

```
y := 1;
z := 0;
while (z != x) {
    z := z + 1;
    y := y * z;
}
```

The goal is to write specifications such as:

- “Program  $P$  computes a number  $y$  whose square is less than the input  $x$ ”
- “Program  $P$  is a program such that at the end of  $P$ , array of integers  $a$  contains numbers in increasing order”

The goal is to write specifications such as:

- “Program  $P$  computes a number  $y$  whose square is less than the input  $x$ ”
- “Program  $P$  is a program such that at the end of  $P$ , array of integers  $a$  contains numbers in increasing order”

We will do this by using the following logical formalism combining programs with logical specifications.

$$\langle \textcolor{blue}{F} \rangle P \langle \textcolor{blue}{G} \rangle$$

- $\langle x > 0 \rangle P \langle y * y < x \rangle$
- $\langle \top \rangle P \langle \forall i. ((0 \leq i < |a| - 1) \rightarrow a[i] \leq a[i + 1]) \rangle$

Hoare triple:  $\langle F \rangle P \langle G \rangle$

- $F$  and  $G$  are FOL formulas.
  - Terms: integers, booleans, sequences and their operations (we will be more precise when needed).
  - Predicates: all standard arithmetic predicates about integers, booleans, and their operations.
  - $F$  is called **precondition**
  - $G$  is called **postcondition**
- $P$  is a program written in an imperative programming language, which has:
  - a state\* which is a **function  $l$  mapping any variable name  $x$  to an integer  $l(x)$**
  - a given grammar.
- **state  $l$  satisfies  $F$**  ( $l$  is a  $F$ -state), written  $l \models F$  when
  - $\mathcal{M} \models_l F$ , for some **standard model  $\mathcal{M}$**  (contains all integers and interprets terms and predicates in the “standard way”)
- quantifiers in  $F$  and  $G$  contain variables not occurring in  $P$ .

---

\* A state is very similar to the **environment** in FOL semantics

for any state  $l$  such that  $l(x) = -2$  and  $l(y) = 5$  and  $l(z) = -1$ :

→  $l \models \neg(x + y < z)$  holds

→  $l \models y - x * z < z$  does not hold

Arithmetic Expressions:  $E ::= 0 \mid 1 \mid 2 \mid 3 \mid \dots \mid -1 \mid -2 \mid -3 \mid \dots$   
 $\mid x \mid (-E) \mid (E + E) \mid (E - E) \mid (E * E)$   
 $\mid \text{if } B \text{ then } E \text{ else } E \mid S[E] \mid |S|$

Sequence Expressions:  $S ::= s \mid S[..E] \mid S[E..] \mid S[E..E]$

Boolean Expressions:  $B ::= \text{true} \mid \text{false} \mid (!B) \mid (B \& B) \mid (B \parallel B)$   
 $\mid (E < E) \mid (E > E) \mid (E = E)$

Commands:  $C ::= (x := E) \mid C; C \mid \text{if } B \text{ then } C \text{ else } C \mid \text{while } B \{C\}$

The book has a simpler language. Here (and in assignments/exams) we will use this richer language.

→ Binding precedence for arithmetic expressions:

- Negation ( $-E$ ) binds more tightly than
- multiplication ( $E_1 * E_2$ ) which binds more tightly than
- subtraction ( $E_1 - E_2$ ) and addition ( $E_1 + E_2$ )

→ Binding precedence for boolean expressions:

- Nation ( $!E$ ) binds more tightly than
- conjunction ( $E_1 \& E_2$ ) disjunction ( $E_1 \parallel E_2$ ).



Arithmetic Expressions:  $E ::= 0 \mid 1 \mid 2 \mid 3 \mid \dots \mid -1 \mid -2 \mid -3 \mid \dots$   
 $\mid x \mid (-E) \mid (E + E) \mid (E - E) \mid (E * E)$   
 $\mid \text{if } B \text{ then } E \text{ else } E \mid S[E] \mid |S|$

Sequence Expressions:  $S ::= s \mid S[..E] \mid S[E..] \mid S[E..E]$

Boolean Expressions:  $B ::= \text{true} \mid \text{false} \mid (!B) \mid (B \& B) \mid (B \parallel B)$   
 $\mid (E < E) \mid (E > E) \mid (E = E)$

Commands:  $C ::= (x := E) \mid C; C \mid \text{if } B \text{ then } C \text{ else } C \mid \text{while } B \{C\}$

→ There is a 1-1 correspondence between arithmetic/boolean expressions, and terms/formulas of the FOL we use to write specifications.

- the program expression  $!(x < y)$  corresponds to the FOL formula  $\neg(x < y)$
- the program expression  $!(x < z) \& (y < z)$  corresponds to the FOL formula  $\neg(x < z) \wedge (y < z)$
- what program expression corresponds to the FOL formula  $(x = y)$ ?

$$\langle \textcolor{blue}{F} \rangle C \langle \textcolor{blue}{G} \rangle$$

High-level meaning of a Hoare triple: if we execute  $C$  in any state  $l$  that satisfies  $\textcolor{blue}{F}$ ,  
[...]<sup>(next slides)</sup> the final state will satisfy  $\textcolor{blue}{G}$ .

$$l \text{ satisfies } \textcolor{blue}{F} : l \models \textcolor{blue}{F}$$

$l$  maps **variables** to **integers**.

Are the following true?

$$\rightarrow \{x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 2\} \models x < y$$

$$\rightarrow \{x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 2\} \models x > y$$

$$\rightarrow \{x \mapsto 1, y \mapsto 2\} \models (x + 1) = y$$

$$\vdash_{\text{par}} (F) \ C \ (\textcolor{blue}{G})$$

Meaning of partial Hoare triple: if we execute  $C$  in any state  $l$  that satisfies  $\textcolor{blue}{F}$ , and if  $C$  **terminates**, then the final state will satisfy  $\textcolor{blue}{G}$ .

Equivalently: for all  $l$  such that  $l \models \textcolor{blue}{F}$ , if  $\textcolor{blue}{l}, C \Downarrow \textcolor{blue}{l}'$  then for the final state  $l'$  we have  $l' \models \textcolor{blue}{G}$ .

- **Correctness**: the pre- and post-conditions  $\textcolor{blue}{F}$  and  $\textcolor{blue}{G}$  give a **specification** of the program
- **Partial**: the above statement does not guarantee that  $C$  will terminate (which is a part of its correct operation)
- An infinite loop satisfies all pairs of pre-/post-conditions.

```
while (true) {  $x := 0$  }
```

$$\vdash_{\text{tot}} (\{F\}) C (\{G\})$$

Meaning of total Hoare triple: if we execute  $C$  in any state  $l$  that satisfies  $F$ , then  $C$  terminates and the final state will satisfy  $G$ .

Equivalently: for all  $l$  such that  $l \models F$  we have  $l, C \Downarrow l'$  and for the final state  $l'$  we have  $l' \models G$ .

- **Correctness:** the pre- and post-conditions  $F$  and  $G$  give a **specification** of the program
- **Total:** the above statement **does** guarantee that  $C$  will terminate

**Q:** are the following statements correct?

- If  $\vdash_{\text{tot}} (\{F\}) C (\{G\})$  holds then  $\vdash_{\text{par}} (\{F\}) C (\{G\})$  holds.
- If  $\vdash_{\text{par}} (\{F\}) C (\{G\})$  holds then  $\vdash_{\text{tot}} (\{F\}) C (\{G\})$  holds.

$$\vdash_{\text{tot}} (\{F\}) C (\{G\})$$

Meaning of total Hoare triple: if we execute  $C$  in any state  $l$  that satisfies  $F$ , then  $C$  terminates and the final state will satisfy  $G$ .

Equivalently: for all  $l$  such that  $l \models F$  we have  $l, C \downarrow l'$  and for the final state  $l'$  we have  $l' \models G$ .

- **Correctness:** the pre- and post-conditions  $F$  and  $G$  give a specification of the program
- **Total:** the above statement **does** guarantee that  $C$  will terminate

**Q:** are the following statements correct?

- If  $\vdash_{\text{tot}} (\{F\}) C (\{G\})$  holds then  $\vdash_{\text{par}} (\{F\}) C (\{G\})$  holds.    **Yes**
- If  $\vdash_{\text{par}} (\{F\}) C (\{G\})$  holds then  $\vdash_{\text{tot}} (\{F\}) C (\{G\})$  holds.    **No**

Consider the imperative factorial function:

```
y := 1;  
z := 0;  
while (z != x) {  
  z := z + 1;  
  y := y * z;  
}
```

Should we be able to prove the following?

$$\rightarrow \vdash_{\text{tot}} (x \geq 0) \text{ C } (F)$$

$$\rightarrow \vdash_{\text{par}} (x \geq 0) \text{ C } (F)$$

$$\rightarrow \vdash_{\text{tot}} (\top) \text{ C } (F)$$

$$\rightarrow \vdash_{\text{par}} (\top) \text{ C } (F)$$

where  $F$  is a formula, not specified here.

Consider the imperative factorial function:

```

y := 1;
z := 0;
while (z != x) {
  z := z + 1;
  y := y * z;
}

```

Should we be able to prove the following?

$$\rightarrow \vdash_{\text{tot}} (\lfloor x \geq 0 \rfloor) \text{ C } (\textcolor{blue}{F})$$

$$\rightarrow \vdash_{\text{par}} (\lfloor x \geq 0 \rfloor) \text{ C } (\textcolor{blue}{F})$$

$$\rightarrow \vdash_{\text{tot}} (\top) \text{ C } (\textcolor{blue}{F}) \quad \textbf{No: does not terminate in starting states with } x < 0$$

$$\rightarrow \vdash_{\text{par}} (\top) \text{ C } (\textcolor{blue}{F})$$

where  $\textcolor{blue}{F}$  is a formula, not specified here.

Consider the imperative factorial function:

```
y := 1;  
z := 0;  
while (z != x) {  
  z := z + 1;  
  y := y * z;  
}
```

Specification:  $\vdash_{\text{par}} (x \geq 0) \text{ C } (F)$

What is the right postcondition  $F$  for the above code?



Consider the imperative factorial function:

```

y := 1;
z := 0;
while (z != x) {
  z := z + 1;
  y := y * z;
}

```

Specification:  $\vdash_{\text{par}} (x \geq 0) \text{ C } (F)$

What is the right postcondition  $F$  for the above code?

$$\vdash_{\text{par}} (x \geq 0) \text{ C } (y = x!)$$

What is the right post-condition for this version of factorial?

```
y := 1;
while (x != 0) {
  y := y * x;
  x := x - 1;
}
```

---

<sup>†</sup>Dafny calls them **ghost variables**

What is the right post-condition for this version of factorial?

```

y := 1;
while (x != 0) {
  y := y * x;
  x := x - 1;
}
    
```

$$\vdash_{\text{par}} ((x = x_0) \wedge (x \geq 0)) \sqsubset (y = x_0!)$$

- **logical variables**<sup>†</sup>: variable  $x_0$  is used only in formulas to “remember” some value from the starting state.
- **program variables**: variables used by the program

---

<sup>†</sup>Dafny calls them **ghost variables**

$$\frac{\vdash_{\text{AR}} F' \rightarrow F \quad ((F) \subset (G)) \quad \vdash_{\text{AR}} G \rightarrow G'}{((F') \subset (G'))} \text{IMPL}$$

$\vdash_{\text{AR}} F' \rightarrow F$  means that the implication is derivable in FOL with natural numbers, equality, standard predicates etc., when all known properties of arithmetic are in our assumptions.

$$\frac{}{(\textcolor{blue}{G}[E/x]) \ x = E \ (\textcolor{blue}{G})} \text{ASG}$$

$$\frac{(\langle F \wedge B \rangle C_1 \langle G \rangle) \quad (\langle F \wedge \neg B \rangle C_2 \langle G \rangle)}{(\langle F \rangle \text{ if } B \text{ then } C_1 \text{ else } C_2 \langle G \rangle)} \text{ COND}$$

$$\frac{(\textcolor{blue}{F}) \ C_1 \ (\textcolor{blue}{\eta}) \quad (\textcolor{blue}{\eta}) \ C_2 \ (\textcolor{blue}{G})}{(\textcolor{blue}{F}) \ C_1; C_2 \ (\textcolor{blue}{G})} \text{ COMP}$$

## EXAMPLES

Prove the following Hoare triples:

$$\rightarrow \langle y > 0 \rangle x = y + 1 \langle x > 0 \rangle$$

$$\rightarrow \langle x \geq y \rangle x = x - y \langle x \geq 0 \rangle$$

$$\rightarrow \langle x \geq y \rangle x = x - y; y = -x \langle y \leq 0 \rangle$$

→ Swap without temp:

$$\langle (x = x_0) \wedge (y = y_0) \rangle x = y - x; y = y - x; x = x + y \langle (x = y_0) \wedge (y = x_0) \rangle$$

$$\rightarrow \langle \top \rangle \text{ if } x < 2 \text{ then } x = 2 \text{ else } x = x \langle x \geq 2 \rangle$$

$$\frac{}{\langle G[E/x] \rangle x = E \langle G \rangle} \text{ASG}$$

$$\frac{\langle F \wedge B \rangle C_1 \langle G \rangle \quad \langle F \wedge \neg B \rangle C_2 \langle G \rangle}{\langle F \rangle \text{ if } B \text{ then } C_1 \text{ else } C_2 \langle G \rangle} \text{COND}$$

$$\frac{\langle F \rangle C_1 \langle \eta \rangle \quad \langle \eta \rangle C_2 \langle G \rangle}{\langle F \rangle C_1; C_2 \langle G \rangle} \text{COMP}$$

$$\frac{\vdash_{\text{AR}} F' \rightarrow F \quad \langle F \rangle C \langle G \rangle \quad \vdash_{\text{AR}} G \rightarrow G'}{\langle F' \rangle C \langle G' \rangle} \text{IMPL}$$