## CS 4110

# Programming Languages & Logics

Lecture 11 More Hoare Logic

1. Choose the relation you're going to induct over.

- 1. Choose the relation you're going to induct over.
- 2. Write down a property,  $P(\mathcal{D}) = \dots$

- 1. Choose the relation you're going to induct over.
- 2. Write down a property,  $P(\mathcal{D}) = \dots$
- 3. For every rule in the relation:
  - a. Write down the derivation tree rooted at that rule. Use : to indicate any omitted remainder of the tree.

- Choose the relation you're going to induct over.
- 2. Write down a property,  $P(\mathcal{D}) = \dots$
- 3. For every rule in the relation:
  - a. Write down the derivation tree rooted at that rule. Use : to indicate any omitted remainder of the tree.
  - b. Write down  $P(\mathcal{D})$  for this derivation tree. That's your goal.

- Choose the relation you're going to induct over.
- 2. Write down a property,  $P(\mathcal{D}) = \dots$
- 3. For every rule in the relation:
  - a. Write down the derivation tree rooted at that rule. Use : to indicate any omitted remainder of the tree.
  - b. Write down  $P(\mathcal{D})$  for this derivation tree. That's your goal.
  - c. Is the goal vacuously true? If so, you're done!

- 1. Choose the relation you're going to induct over.
- 2. Write down a property,  $P(\mathcal{D}) = \dots$
- 3. For every rule in the relation:
  - a. Write down the derivation tree rooted at that rule. Use : to indicate any omitted remainder of the tree.
  - b. Write down  $P(\mathcal{D})$  for this derivation tree. That's your goal.
  - c. Is the goal vacuously true? If so, you're done!
  - d. Does the goal have premises from the same relation? If not, this is a base case. Reason directly.

- 1. Choose the relation you're going to induct over.
- 2. Write down a property,  $P(\mathcal{D}) = \dots$
- 3. For every rule in the relation:
  - a. Write down the derivation tree rooted at that rule. Use : to indicate any omitted remainder of the tree.
  - b. Write down  $P(\mathcal{D})$  for this derivation tree. That's your goal.
  - c. Is the goal vacuously true? If so, you're done!
  - d. Does the goal have premises from the same relation? If not, this is a base case. Reason directly.
  - e. If so, this is an inductive case. Apply P to those subderivations you marked with vertical dots. Write down the resulting conclusion. Use that fact to prove  $P(\mathcal{D})$  for this derivation.

### Overview

#### Last time

Hoare Logic

#### Today

- "Decorated" programs
- Weakest Preconditions

### Review: Hoare Logic

### **Decorated Programs**

Observation: Once we've identified loop invariants and uses of consequence, the structure of a Hoare logic is determined!

Notation: Can write proofs by "decorating" programs with:

- A precondition ({P})
- A postcondition ({Q})
- Invariants ({/}while b do c)
- Uses of consequence  $\{R\} \Rightarrow \{S\}$
- Assertions between sequences  $c_1$ ;  $\{T\}c_2$

A decorated program describes a valid Hoare logic proof if the rest of the proof tree's structure is implied. (Caveats: Invariants are constrained, etc.)

### **Example: Decorated Factorial**

```
\{x = n \land n > 0\}

y := 1;

while x > 0 do \{

y := y * x;

x := x - 1

\}

\{y = n!\}
```

### **Example: Decorated Factorial**

```
\{x = n \land n > 0\} \Rightarrow
\{1 = 1 \land \mathsf{x} = \mathsf{n} \land \mathsf{n} > \mathsf{0}\}
v := 1:
\{y = 1 \land x = n \land n > 0\} \Rightarrow
\{y * x! = n! \land x > 0\}
while x > 0 do {
       \{y * x! = n! \land x > 0 \land x > 0\} \Rightarrow
       \{y * x * (x - 1)! = n! \land (x - 1) > 0\}
       V := V * X:
       \{y * (x - 1)! = n! \land (x - 1) > 0\}
       x := x - 1
       \{v * x! = n! \land x > 0\}
\{y * x! = n! \land (x > 0) \land \neg (x > 0)\} \Rightarrow
\{v = n!\}
```

Check whether a decorated program represents a valid proof using local consistency checks.

Check whether a decorated program represents a valid proof using local consistency checks.

For **skip**, the precondition and postcondition should be the same:

For sequences,  $\{P\}$   $c_1$   $\{R\}$  and  $\{R\}$   $c_2$   $\{Q\}$  must be (recursively) locally consistent:

```
{P}
c<sub>1</sub>;
{R}
c<sub>2</sub>
{Q}
```

Assignment should use the substitution from the rule:

$$\begin{cases}
 P[a/x] \\
 x := a \\
 \{P\}
 \end{cases}$$

An **if** is locally consistent when both branches are locally consistent after adding the branch condition to each:

```
if b then
 \{P \wedge b\}
 c_1
 {Q}
else
 \{P \wedge \neg b\}
 c_2
 {Q}
{Q}
```

Decorate a **while** with the loop invariant:

```
 \begin{array}{l} \{P\} \\ \textbf{while } b \textbf{ do} \\ \{P \wedge b\} \\ c \\ \{P\} \\ \{P \wedge \neg b\} \end{array}
```

To capture the Consequence rule, you can always write a (valid) implication:

$$\{P\} \Rightarrow \{Q\}$$

```
{
while (0 < y) do (
    x := x + 1;
    y := y - 1
)
{
}</pre>
```

```
\{x = m \land y = n \land 0 \le n\}
while (0 < y) do (x := x + 1;
y := y - 1
)
\{x = m + n\}
```

```
\{x = m \land y = n \land 0 \le n\} \Rightarrow
 while (0 < y) do (
    \{I \land 0 < y\} \Rightarrow
    \{I[y-1/y][x+1/x]\}
    x := x + 1:
    \{/[y-1/y]\}
    y := y - 1
    {/}
 \{I \land 0 \not< y\} \Rightarrow
 {x = m + n}
Where I is (x = m + n - y) \land 0 \le y.
```

```
\{ \ \ \} while (x \neq 0) do (x := x - 1)
```

```
 \begin{cases} \textbf{true} \\ \textbf{while} \ (x \neq 0) \ \textbf{do} \ (\\ x := x - 1 \\ ) \\ \{x = 0\} \end{cases}
```

```
{
  y := 1
while (0 < x) do (
  x := x - 1;
  y := y * 2
)
{
  }</pre>
```

```
\{x = n \land 0 \le n\}
y := 1
while (0 < x) do (
x := x - 1;
y := y * 2
)
\{y = 2^n\}
```