

PROGRAMMING LANGUAGES:

IMPERATIVE PROGRAM CONSTRUCTION

12. SEPARATION LOGIC II

Shin-Cheng Mu

Autumn Term, 2021

National Taiwan University and Academia Sinica

EXAMPLE: LIST REVERSAL

- Finally we come to the canonical example: in-place list reversal.
- The aim is to come up with a program:

{ i represents XS }

list_reversal

{ j represents reverse XS }

- But how to formally express “*i* represents *XS*”?

SPECIFICATION

LISTS

- Well... let us quickly introduce an abstract notion of lists... and a bit of functional programming.
- **data** *List* = [] | *Int* : *List* — a list is either the empty list [], or *x* : *xs* where *x* is *Int* and *xs* is a list.
- E.g *1* : *2* : *3* : [] is a list containing three items, *1*, *2*, and *3*.
- We sometimes denote *x* : [] by [*x*], and *x* : *y* : *z* : [] by [*x*, *y*, *z*].
- Deconstructors: *head* (*1* : *2* : *3* : []) = *1*,
tail (*1* : *2* : *3* : []) = *2* : *3* : [].
- For nonempty *xs*, we have *xs* = *head xs* : *tail xs*.

- List reversal:

reverse :: *List* → *List*

reverse [] = []

reverse (x : xs) = *reverse* xs ++ [x] .

- *reverse* above is a very slow ($O(n^2)$) algorithm.

FASTER REVERSAL

- One can come up with a faster algorithm using associativity.
- Let $rev\ xs\ ys = reverse\ xs \mathrel{++} ys$. The function rev has a faster implementation (which can be calculated!):

$$\begin{aligned} rev\ []\quad\quad ys &= ys \\ rev\ (x : xs)\ ys &= rev\ xs\ (x : ys) \end{aligned}$$

- We can then let $reverse\ xs = rev\ xs\ []$.
- It actually resembles a loop...

REPRESENTING A LIST

- A list $1 : 2 : 3 : []$ is an abstract entity. We have to represent it in our heap.
- By $list\ xs\ i$ we denote that “the heap represents (exactly) the list xs , with the first node in address i .”

$$list\ [] \quad i \equiv \mathbf{emp} \wedge i = \mathbf{nil}$$

$$list\ (x : xs)\ i \equiv \langle \exists k :: (i \mapsto x, k) * list\ xs\ k \rangle .$$

- Another way:

$$\begin{aligned} list\ xs\ i &\equiv (xs = [] \wedge \mathbf{emp} \wedge i = \mathbf{nil}) \vee \\ &\quad (xs \neq [] \wedge \\ &\quad \langle \exists k :: (i \mapsto head\ xs, k) * list\ (tail\ xs)\ k \rangle) \end{aligned}$$

- Recall that in the program for fast division in Handouts 8, the variable k in the following program was needed only for the proof, not for computing the result.

```
{A = q × b + r ∧ 0 ≤ r < b ∧  
  0 ≤ k ∧ b = 2k × B, bnd : b}  
do b ≠ B →  
  ... q, b, k := q × 2, b / 2, k - 1 ...  
od  
{A = q × B + r ∧ 0 ≤ r < B}
```

- k was called a “ghost variable”. It makes the program easier to prove (and derive). Afterwards we can remove it and use existential quantification instead:

$$\{A = q \times b + r \wedge 0 \leq r < b \wedge$$

$$\langle \exists k : 0 \leq k : b = 2^k \times B \rangle, bnd : b\}$$

$$\text{do } b \neq B \rightarrow \dots q, b := q \times 2, b / 2 \dots$$

$$\text{od}$$

- For this problem we will use ghost variables representing lists.

Problem specification:

```
con XS : List  
var i,j : Int  
{list XS i}  
list_reversal  
{list (reverse XS) j}
```

USING ASSOCIATIVITY

OLD TRICK: USING ASSOCIATIVITY

- We use our old trick — come up with a loop invariant that exploits associativity.
- Try $reverse\ XS = reverse\ xs \mathbin{++} ys$.
- Initialised by $xs, ys := XS, []$.
- Loop terminates when $xs = []$.
- Strategy: try to shorten xs in each step. Bound of loop is length of xs .

- Program outline:

```
con XS : List
var i, j : Int, xs, ys : List
{list XS i}
xs, ys, j := XS, [], nil
{reverse XS = reverse xs ++ ys ∧
  (list xs i * list ys j)}
do xs ≠ [] → ???
od
{list (reverse XS) j}
```

LOOP BODY

- How do we shorten xs ? When $xs \neq []$, it can be split into head and tail.

$\{reverse\ XS = reverse\ xs \ ++\ ys \wedge \dots\}$

$\{reverse\ XS = reverse\ (head\ xs : tail\ xs) \ ++\ ys \wedge \dots\}$

$x, xs := head\ xs, tail\ xs$

$\{reverse\ XS = reverse\ (x : xs) \ ++\ ys \wedge \dots\}$

$\{reverse\ XS = reverse\ xs \ ++\ (x : ys) \wedge \dots\}$

$ys := x : ys$

$\{reverse\ XS = reverse\ xs \ ++\ ys\}$

- Note that the last step, $ys := x : ys$, is similar to $n := 1 + n$ in other loops.
 - We try to establish the invariant for $x : ys$ (or $n + 1$), then assign $ys = x : ys$ (or $n := n + 1$) to restore the invariant.

- To justify the implication in the middle:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{reverse } (x : xs) \mathbin{++} ys \\ = & \{ \text{definition of reverse} \} \\ & (\text{reverse } xs \mathbin{++} [x]) \mathbin{++} ys \\ = & \{ (+) \text{ associative} \} \\ & \text{reverse } xs \mathbin{++} ([x] \mathbin{++} ys) \\ = & \{ \text{definition of } (+) \} \\ & \text{reverse } xs \mathbin{++} (x : ys) . \end{aligned}$$

- Similar to how we used associativity in other programs.

POINTER MANIPULATION

POINTER MANIPULATION

- But all these were about abstract lists. We have to update i and j as well.
- In the code below we omit $reverse\ XS = ..$ in the assertions and focus on i and j .

```
{list xs i * list ys j}  
x, xs := head xs, tail xs  
{list (x : xs) i * list ys j}  
???  
{list xs i * list (x : ys) j}  
ys := x : ys  
{list xs i * list ys j}
```

- What to do in ????

SHUNTING A NODE

- Expand definitions of $\text{list } (x : xs) \ i * \text{list } ys \ j$ and $\text{list } xs \ i * \text{list } (x : ys) \ j$:

$$\{\langle \exists k :: (i \mapsto x, k) * \text{list } xs \ k \rangle * \text{list } ys \ j\}$$

???

$$\{\text{list } xs \ i * \langle \exists l :: (j \mapsto x, l) * \text{list } ys \ l \rangle\}$$

- Use a lookup to remove the existential quantification:

$$\{\langle \exists k :: (i \mapsto x, k) * \text{list } xs \ k \rangle * \text{list } ys \ j\}$$

$$k := *(i + 1)$$

$$\{(i \mapsto x, k) * \text{list } xs \ k * \text{list } ys \ j\}$$

???

$$\{\text{list } xs \ i * \langle \exists l :: (j \mapsto x, l) * \text{list } ys \ l \rangle\}$$

- Compare the pre/post-conditions, and perform some substitution:

$\{\langle \exists k :: (i \mapsto x, k) * \text{list } xs \ k \rangle * \text{list } ys \ j \}$

$k := *(i + 1)$

$\{(i \mapsto x, k) * \text{list } xs \ k * \text{list } ys \ j \}$

???

$\{\text{list } xs \ k * \langle \exists l :: (i \mapsto x, l) * \text{list } ys \ l \rangle \}$

$i, j := k, i$

$\{\text{list } xs \ i * \langle \exists l :: (j \mapsto x, l) * \text{list } ys \ l \rangle \}$

- Guess: let l be j :

$\{\langle \exists k :: (i \mapsto x, k) * \text{list } xs \ k \rangle * \text{list } ys \ j\}$

$k := *(i + 1)$

$\{(i \mapsto x, k) * \text{list } xs \ k * \text{list } ys \ j\}$

???

$\{\text{list } xs \ k * (i \mapsto x, j) * \text{list } ys \ j\}$

$i, j := k, i$

$\{\text{list } xs \ i * \langle \exists l :: (j \mapsto x, l) * \text{list } ys \ l \rangle\}$

- Apparently all that's left to do is —

$\{\langle \exists k :: (i \mapsto x, k) * \text{list } xs \ k \rangle * \text{list } ys \ j \}$

$k := *(i + 1)$

$\{(i \mapsto x, k) * \text{list } xs \ k * \text{list } ys \ j \}$

$*(i + 1) := j$

$\{\text{list } xs \ k * (i \mapsto x, j) * \text{list } ys \ j \}$

$i, j := k, i$

$\{\text{list } xs \ i * \langle \exists l :: (j \mapsto x, l) * \text{list } ys \ l \rangle \}$

PROGRAM SO FAR

```
{list XS i}  
xs, ys, j := XS, [], nil  
{reverse XS = reverse xs ++ ys ∧  
  (list xs i * list ys j)}  
do xs ≠ [] →  
  x, xs := head xs, tail xs  
  {(list (x : xs) i * list ys j) ∧  
    reverse XS = reverse (x : xs) ++ ys}  
  k := *(i + 1)  
  *(i + 1) := j  
  i, j := k, i  
  {(list xs i * list (x : ys) j) ∧  
    reverse XS = reverse xs ++ (x : ys)}  
  ys := x : ys  
od  
{list (reverse XS) i}
```

REMOVE GHOST VARIABLES

- Finally, recall that we do not actually have *List* in the executable code.
- Remove all the ghost variables.
- $xs \neq []$ can be replaced by $i \neq \text{nil}$.

- Final program:

```
var i,j,k : Int
{list XS i}
j := nil
{ $\langle \exists xs, ys :: (list\ xs\ i * list\ ys\ j) \wedge$ 
  reverse XS = reverse xs ++ ys  $\rangle$ }
do i  $\neq$  nil  $\rightarrow$  k := *(i + 1)
               *(i + 1) := j
               i,j := k,i
od
{list (reverse XS) j}
```

DISCUSSIONS

- With the ghost variables presented, it is clear that the derivation of this program follows the pattern we have been practicing:
 - construct an invariant that exploits associativity;
 - make progress by shifting some elements to the “accumulating” part;
 - the last assignment drives the loop.
- Without the ghost variable, leaving us with a less comprehensible program.

- The invariant, the bound, the hidden variables... these are what drives the development of the program. They are the foundation of the program.
- The executable code is merely derived.
- However, these foundations are often hidden in comments, removed, or forgotten. Only the executable code remains. Like flooded landscape where you see only the tips of hills.
- Programs are not supposed to be understood by reading the executable code.

- We could merely touch a little bit of separation logic.
- I highly recommend Reynold's paper or lecture notes for more information.