### 1 How do we check entailments?

- 1. Create set of "axioms" based on the program and the entailment to check
  - (a) Datatype Declarations
    - Enumeration types: Variables, Classes, Fields
    - ADT: Path
  - (b) Function Declarations
    - Declared: path-equivalence, instance-of, instantiated-by
    - Defined recursively: substitute
  - (c) Calculus rules as all quantified formulas
    - Static Rules: C-Refl, C-Class, C-Subst
    - Template Rules: C-Prog
  - (d) Assert entailment to be checked:  $c_1, ..., c_n \vdash c \Rightarrow \neg(c_1 \land ... \land c_n \rightarrow c)$
- 2. Obtain Solution: Does the entailment contradict the rules?
  - If unsat: valid/correct entailment.
  - If sat: invalid entailment.

# 1.1 General First-Order Encoding Template

Variable ()	(1)
Field ()	(2)
Class ()	(3)
${\tt Path}\;(({\tt Variable})\;({\tt Path}\;{\tt Field}))$	(4)
$\equiv$ : Path $ imes$ Path $ o$ ${\cal B}$	(5)
$::: \mathtt{Path}  imes \mathtt{Class}  o \mathcal{B}$	(6)
$.\mathbf{cls} \equiv : \mathtt{Path}  imes \mathtt{Class}  o \mathcal{B}$	(7)
$_{-\{\!\{\mapsto\}\!\}}$ : Path $ imes$ Variable $ imes$ Path $ o$ Path	(8)
$orall p$ :Path. $p \equiv p$	(9)
$orall a \colon \mathcal{B}, p \colon \mathtt{Path}, c \colon \mathtt{Class}.$	(10)
$(a \to p.\mathbf{cls} \equiv c) \to (a \to p :: c)$	(11)
$\forall a \colon\! \mathcal{B}, p \colon\! \mathtt{Path}, q \colon\! \mathtt{Path}, r \colon\! \mathtt{Path}, s \colon\! \mathtt{Path}, x \colon\! \mathtt{Variable}.$	(12)
$(a \to p_{\{\!\!\{ x \mapsto r \}\!\!\}} \equiv q_{\{\!\!\{ x \mapsto r \}\!\!\}} \land (a \to s \equiv r)) \to$	(13)
$(a \to p_{\{\!\!\{x \mapsto s\}\!\!\}} \equiv q_{\{\!\!\{x \mapsto s\}\!\!\}})$	(14)
$\forall a \colon\! \mathcal{B}, p \colon\! \mathtt{Path}, c \colon\! \mathtt{Class}, r \colon\! \mathtt{Path}, s \colon\! \mathtt{Path}, x \colon\! \mathtt{Variable}.$	(15)
$(a \to p_{\{\!\!\{ x \mapsto r \}\!\!\}} :: c \land (a \to s \equiv r)) \to$	(16)
$(a \to p_{\{x \mapsto s\}} :: c)$	(17)
$\forall a \!:\! \mathcal{B}, p \!:\! \mathtt{Path}, c \!:\! \mathtt{Class}, r \!:\! \mathtt{Path}, s \!:\! \mathtt{Path}, x \!:\! \mathtt{Variable}.$	(18)
$(a \to p_{\{\!\!\{ x \mapsto r \}\!\!\}}.\mathbf{cls} \equiv c \land (a \to s \equiv r)) \to$	(19)
$(a \to p_{\{\!\!\{x \mapsto s\}\!\!\}}.\mathbf{cls} \equiv c)$	(20)
$orall a \colon \mathcal{B}, p \colon \mathtt{Path.} \ (a  o igwedge)  o (a  o p :: \_)$	(21)

#### 1.2 Natural Numbers Program

$$\begin{aligned} &\operatorname{Zero}(x.\ \epsilon) & (22) \\ &\operatorname{Succ}(x.\ x.p :: \operatorname{Nat}) & (23) \\ &\forall x.\ x :: \operatorname{Zero} \Rightarrow x :: \operatorname{Nat} & (24) \\ &\forall x.\ x :: \operatorname{Succ}, x.p :: \operatorname{Nat} \Rightarrow x :: \operatorname{Nat} & (25) \\ &\operatorname{prev}(x.\ x :: \operatorname{Nat}) : [y.\ y :: \operatorname{Nat}] & (26) \\ &\operatorname{prev}(x.\ x :: \operatorname{Zero}) : [y.\ y :: \operatorname{Nat}] := \operatorname{new} \operatorname{Zero}() & (27) \\ &\operatorname{prev}(x.\ x :: \operatorname{Succ}, x.p :: \operatorname{Nat}) : [y.\ y :: \operatorname{Nat}] := x.p & (28) \end{aligned}$$

#### 1.3 C-Prog Rules for Natural Numbers Program

$$\forall a:\mathcal{B}, p: \mathtt{Path}. \tag{29}$$

$$(a \to p :: \mathtt{Zero}) \to \tag{30}$$

$$(a \to p :: \mathtt{Nat}) \tag{31}$$

$$\forall a:\mathcal{B}, p: \mathtt{Path}. \tag{32}$$

$$(a \to p :: \mathtt{Succ} \land x.p_{\{\!\!\{x \mapsto p\}\!\!\}} :: \mathtt{Nat}) \to \tag{33}$$

$$(a \to p :: \mathtt{Nat}) \tag{34}$$

## 2 Example Entailments

#### 2.1 Working valid entailment

 $p.\mathbf{cls} \equiv \mathtt{Zero} \vdash p :: \mathtt{Nat}$ 

- Checks unsatisfiable
- Unsat Core: C-Class, C-Prog-Zero

#### 2.2 Working invalid entailment

TODO: search type checking tests for (non-trivial) SAT entailment  $\vdash x \equiv y$ 

- $\bullet$  Checks satisfiable
- Model:  $p \equiv q \doteq p = q$

### 2.3 Non-working invalid entailment

 $x \equiv y \vdash x \equiv z$ 

- Checks unsatisfiable, but shouldn't
- Unsat Core: C-Subst-PathEq
- TODO: possible reason? (check instantiation of subst rule)

### 2.4 Non-working invalid entailment

field Access Time out.smt

- Neither checks satisfiable nor unsatisfiable.
- Solver has "infinite" runtime.
- TODO: check manually for a model?

# 3 Undefinedness

- 3.1 adding  $\neg x \equiv x.p$  results in ????
- **3.2** asserting  $x :: Zero \land x :: Nat is SAT$

But with further investigation, again doesn't seem to be a problem, as we are searching conflicts