CS 4110

Programming Languages & Logics

Lecture 11
Weakest Preconditions

21 September 2016

Announcements

- Homework #3 due tonight at 11:59pm
- Homework #4 out now

Review: Decorating Programs

$\{\textbf{true}\}$

$x := m;$
$y := 0;$
while $(n < x)$ **do** (
  $x := x - n;$
  $y := y + 1$
)

$\{$ $\}$

Review: Decorating Programs

$\{\textbf{true}\}$

$x := m;$
$y := 0;$
while $(n < x)$ **do** (
  $x := x - n;$
  $y := y + 1$
)

$\{n * y + x = m\}$

In other words, the program divides m by n, so y is the quotient and x is the remainder.

Review: Decorating Programs

$\{\textbf{true}\}$

$x := m;$
$y := 0;$
$\{n \times y + x = m\}$
while $(n < x)$ **do** (
  $\{n \times y + x = m \ \wedge \ n < x\}$
  $x := x - n;$
  $y := y + 1$
  $\{n \times y + x = m\}$
)
$\{n \times y + x = m \ \wedge \ x < n\}$

$\{n * y + x = m\}$

Review: Decorating Programs

$\{\textbf{true}\}$

$\{n \times 0 + m = m\}$
$x := m;$
$\{n \times 0 + x = m\}$
$y := 0;$
$\{n \times y + x = m\}$
while $(n < x)$ **do** (
  $\{n \times y + x = m \ \wedge \ n < x\}$
  $\{n \times (y + 1) + (x - n) = m\}$
  $x := x - n;$
  $\{n \times (y + 1) + x = m\}$
  $y := y + 1$
  $\{n \times y + x = m\}$
)
$\{n \times y + x = m \ \wedge \ x < n\}$

$\{n * y + x = m\}$

Review: Decorating Programs

$\{\textbf{true}\} \Rightarrow \{n \times 0 + m = m\}$
$x := m;$
$\{n \times 0 + x = m\}$
$y := 0;$
$\{n \times y + x = m\}$
while $(n < x)$ **do** (
  $\{n \times y + x = m \ \wedge \ n < x\} \Rightarrow \{n \times (y + 1) + (x - n) = m\}$
  $x := x - n;$
  $\{n \times (y + 1) + x = m\}$
  $y := y + 1$
  $\{n \times y + x = m\}$
)
$\{n \times y + x = m \ \wedge \ x < n\} \Rightarrow \{n * y + x = m\}$

Generating Preconditions

To fill in a precondition:

$$\{\quad\}\, c\, \{Q\}$$

there are many possible preconditions—and some are more useful than others.

Weakest Preconditions

Intuition: The weakest liberal precondition for c and Q is the weakest assertion P such that $\{P\}\ c\ \{Q\}$ is valid.

Weakest Preconditions

Intuition: The weakest liberal precondition for c and Q is the weakest assertion P such that $\{P\}\ c\ \{Q\}$ is valid.

More formally...

Definition (Weakest Liberal Precondition)

P is a weakest liberal precondition of c and Q written $wlp(c, Q)$ if:

$$\forall \sigma, I.\ \sigma \vDash_I P \iff (\mathcal{C}[\![c]\!]\ \sigma) \text{ undefined } \vee (\mathcal{C}[\![c]\!]\sigma) \vDash_I Q$$

Weakest Preconditions

$$wlp(\textbf{skip}, P) \quad = \quad P$$

Weakest Preconditions

$$
\begin{aligned}
wlp(\textbf{skip}, P) &= P \\
wlp(\mathrm{x} := a, P) &= P[a/\mathrm{x}]
\end{aligned}
$$

Weakest Preconditions

$$
\begin{aligned}
wlp(\textbf{skip}, P) &= P \\
wlp(\mathsf{x} := a, P) &= P[a/\mathsf{x}] \\
wlp((c_1; c_2), P) &= wlp(c_1, wlp(c_2, P))
\end{aligned}
$$

Weakest Preconditions

$$
\begin{aligned}
wlp(\textbf{skip}, P) &= P \\
wlp(\mathrm{x} := a, P) &= P[a/\mathrm{x}] \\
wlp((c_1; c_2), P) &= wlp(c_1, wlp(c_2, P)) \\
wlp(\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_2, P) &= (b \implies wlp(c_1, P)) \wedge \\
&\quad (\neg b \implies wlp(c_2, P))
\end{aligned}
$$

Weakest Preconditions

$$
\begin{aligned}
wlp(\textbf{skip}, P) &= P \\
wlp(\mathrm{x} := a, P) &= P[a/\mathrm{x}] \\
wlp((c_1; c_2), P) &= wlp(c_1, wlp(c_2, P)) \\
wlp(\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_2, P) &= (b \implies wlp(c_1, P)) \wedge \\
&\quad (\neg b \implies wlp(c_2, P)) \\
wlp(\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c, P) &= \bigwedge_i F_i(P)
\end{aligned}
$$

Weakest Preconditions

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
wlp(\textbf{skip}, P) & = & P \\
wlp(\mathsf{x} := a, P) & = & P[a/\mathsf{x}] \\
wlp((c_1; c_2), P) & = & wlp(c_1, wlp(c_2, P)) \\
wlp(\textbf{if } b \textbf{ then } c_1 \textbf{ else } c_2, P) & = & (b \implies wlp(c_1, P)) \wedge \\
 & & (\neg b \implies wlp(c_2, P)) \\
wlp(\textbf{while } b \textbf{ do } c, P) & = & \bigwedge_i F_i(P)
\end{array}
$$

where

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
F_0(P) & = & \textbf{true} \\
F_{i+1}(P) & = & (\neg b \implies P) \wedge (b \implies wlp(c, F_i(P)))
\end{array}
$$

Applications of Weakest Preconditions

Failing fast: avoid wasting work on bad inputs.

```
p := getPacket();
processPacket(p);
assert P_safe
```

Applications of Weakest Preconditions

Failing fast: avoid wasting work on bad inputs.

```
p := getPacket();
processPacket(p);
```
$\{P_{\text{safe}}\}$

Applications of Weakest Preconditions

Failing fast: avoid wasting work on bad inputs.

p := getPacket();
$\{P_{\text{filter}}(p)\}$;
processPacket(p);
$\{P_{\text{safe}}\}$

Applications of Weakest Preconditions

Failing fast: avoid wasting work on bad inputs.

```
p := getPacket();
assert P_filter(p);
processPacket(p);
```

Applications of Weakest Preconditions

Failing fast: avoid wasting work on bad inputs.

```
p := getPacket();
assert P_filter(p);
processPacket(p);
```

P_{filter} should be the *weakest* precondition to avoid ruling out legitimate inputs.

David Brumley, Hao Wang, Somesh Jha, and Dawn Song. "Creating Vulnerability Signatures Using Weakest Preconditions." In *Computer Security Foundations* (CSF), 2007.

Properties of Weakest Preconditions

Lemma (Correctness of Weakest Preconditions)

$$\forall c \in \textbf{Com}, Q \in \textbf{Assn}.$$
$$\vDash \{wlp(c, Q)\}\, c\, \{Q\} \;\; \textit{and}$$
$$\forall R \in \textbf{Assn}.\ \vDash \{R\}\, c\, \{Q\} \;\; \textit{implies}\; (R \implies wlp(c, Q))$$

Properties of Weakest Preconditions

Lemma (Correctness of Weakest Preconditions)

$$\forall c \in \textbf{Com}, Q \in \textbf{Assn}.$$
$$\models \{wlp(c, Q)\}\, c\, \{Q\} \;\; \textit{and}$$
$$\forall R \in \textbf{Assn}.\ \vdash \{R\}\, c\, \{Q\} \;\textit{implies}\; (R \implies wlp(c, Q))$$

Lemma (Provability of Weakest Preconditions)

$$\forall c \in \textbf{Com}, Q \in \textbf{Assn}.\ \vdash \{wlp(c, Q)\}\, c\, \{Q\}$$

Soundness and Completeness

Soundness: If we can prove it, then it's actually true.

Completeness: If it's true, then a proof exists.

Soundness and Completeness

Soundness: If we can prove it, then it's actually true.

Definition (Soundness)

If $\vdash \{P\}\, c\, \{Q\}$ then $\models \{P\}\, c\, \{Q\}$.

Completeness: If it's true, then a proof exists.

Definition (Completeness)

If $\models \{P\}\, c\, \{Q\}$ then $\vdash \{P\}\, c\, \{Q\}$.

vs.



Kurt Gödel

vs.



Sir Tony Hoare

Relative Completeness

Theorem (Cook (1974))

$\forall P, Q \in \mathbf{Assn}, c \in \mathbf{Com}.\ \vDash \{P\}\, c\, \{Q\}$ *implies* $\vdash \{P\}\, c\, \{Q\}$.

Relative Completeness

Theorem (Cook (1974))

$\forall P, Q \in \mathbf{Assn}, c \in \mathbf{Com}.\ \vDash \{P\}\, c\, \{Q\}$ *implies* $\vdash \{P\}\, c\, \{Q\}$.

Proof Sketch.

Let $\{P\}\, c\, \{Q\}$ be a valid partial correctness specification.

By the first Lemma we have $\vDash P \implies wlp(c, Q)$.

By the second Lemma we have $\vdash \{wlp(c, Q)\}\, c\, \{Q\}$.

We conclude $\vdash \{P\}\, c\, \{Q\}$ using the CONSEQUENCE rule. □