

Soundness and Completeness of Axiomatic Semantics




One-Slide Summary

- A system of axiomatic semantics is **sound** if everything we can prove is also true: **if $\vdash \{ A \} c \{ B \}$ then $\models \{ A \} c \{ B \}$**
- We prove this by **simultaneous induction** on the structure of the operational semantics derivation and the axiomatic semantics proof.
- A system of axiomatic semantics is **complete** if we can prove all true things: **if $\models \{ A \} c \{ B \}$ then $\vdash \{ A \} c \{ B \}$**
- Our system is **relatively complete** (= just as complete as the underlying logic). We use **weakest preconditions** to reason about soundness. **Verification conditions** are preconditions that are easy to *compute*.

Where Do We Stand?

- We have a language for asserting properties of programs
- We know when such an assertion is true
- We also have a symbolic method for deriving assertions



Soundness of Axiomatic Semantics

- Formal statement of soundness:

if $\vdash \{ A \} c \{ B \}$ then $\models \{ A \} c \{ B \}$


or, equivalently

For all σ , if $\sigma \models A$

and $Op :: \langle c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma'$

and $Pr :: \vdash \{ A \} c \{ B \}$

then $\sigma' \models B$



- “Op” === “Opsem Derivation”
- “Pr” === “Axiomatic Proof”

Not Easily!

- By induction on the structure of c ?
 - No, problems with while and rule of consequence
- By induction on the structure of Op ?
 - No, problems with while
- By induction on the structure of Pr ?
 - No, problems with consequence
- By simultaneous induction on the structure of Op and Pr
 - Yes! New Technique!

Review: Simultaneous Induction

- Consider two structures \mathcal{O}_p and \mathcal{P}_r
 - Assume that $x < y$ iff x is a substructure of y

- Define the ordering

$(o, p) \prec (o', p')$ iff

$$o < o' \quad \text{or} \quad o = o' \text{ and } p < p'$$

- Called lexicographic (dictionary) ordering
- This \prec is a **well founded order** and leads to simultaneous induction
- If $o < o'$ then p can actually be larger than p' !
- It can even be unrelated to p' !

Soundness of Axiomatic Semantics

- Formal statement of soundness:

If $\vdash \{ A \} c \{ B \}$ then $\models \{ A \} c \{ B \}$

or, equivalently

For all σ , if $\sigma \models A$

and $Op :: \langle c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma'$

and $Pr :: \vdash \{ A \} c \{ B \}$

then $\sigma' \models B$

- “Op” = “Opsem Derivation”
- “Pr” = “Axiomatic Proof”

Soundness of the While Rule

- Case: last rule used in $\text{Pr} : \vdash \{A\} c \{B\}$ was the while rule:

$$\text{Pr}_1 :: \vdash \{A \wedge b\} c \{A\}$$

$$\vdash \{A\} \text{ while } b \text{ do } c \{A \wedge \neg b\}$$

- Two possible rules for the root of Op (*by inversion*)

- We'll only do the complicated case:

$$\text{Op}_1 :: \langle b, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \text{true} \quad \text{Op}_2 :: \langle c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma' \quad \text{Op}_3 :: \langle \text{while } b \text{ do } c, \sigma' \rangle \Downarrow \sigma''$$

$$\langle \text{while } b \text{ do } c, \sigma \rangle \Downarrow \sigma''$$

Assume that $\sigma \models A$

To show that $\sigma'' \models A \wedge \neg b$

- By soundness of booleans and Op_1 we get $\sigma \models b$
 - Hence $\sigma \models A \wedge b$
- By IH on Pr_1 and Op_2 we get $\sigma' \models A$
- By IH on Pr and Op_3 we get $\sigma'' \models A \wedge \neg b$. (tricky!)

Soundness of the While Rule

- Note that in the last use of IH the derivation Pr *did not decrease*
- But Op_3 was a sub-derivation of Op
- See Winskel, Chapter 6.5, for another example of a soundness proof

Completeness of Axiomatic Semantics

- If $\models \{A\} \text{ c } \{B\}$ can we always derive $\vdash \{A\} \text{ c } \{B\}$?
- If so, axiomatic semantics is complete
- If not then there are valid properties of programs that we cannot verify with Hoare rules :- (
- Good news: for our language the Hoare triples are complete
- Bad news: only if the underlying logic is complete
(whenever $\models A$ we also have $\vdash A$)
 - this is called relative completeness

Examples, General Plan

- OK, so:

$$\models \{ x < 5 \wedge z = 2 \} y := x + 2 \{ y < 7 \}$$

- Can we prove it?

$$?\vdash? \{ x < 5 \wedge z = 2 \} y := x + 2 \{ y < 7 \}$$

- Well, we *could* easily prove:

$$\vdash \{ x+2 < 7 \} y := x + 2 \{ y < 7 \}$$

- And we know ...


$$\vdash x < 5 \wedge z = 2 \Rightarrow x+2 < 7$$

- Shouldn't those two proofs be enough?

Proof Idea

- Dijkstra's idea: To verify that $\{ A \} c \{ B \}$
 - a) Find out all predicates A' such that $\models \{ A' \} c \{ B \}$
 - call this set $\text{Pre}(c, B)$ (Pre = “pre-conditions”)
 - b) Verify for one $A' \in \text{Pre}(c, B)$ that $A \Rightarrow A'$

- Assertions can be ordered:



- Thus: compute $\text{WP}(c, B)$ and prove $A \Rightarrow \text{WP}(c, B)$

Logical Strength

- In logic, we say “false” is very *strong* because it allows you to prove anything (i.e., it implies anything)
 - Given “false” you can prove all other claims
- By contrast, we say “true” is very *weak* because assuming it doesn't help you prove anything new
 - If “true \Rightarrow P” you could also have just done “P” directly, so knowing “true” was not necessary
- A is *stronger* than B if $A \Rightarrow B$.

Proof Idea (Cont.)

- Completeness of axiomatic semantics:

If $\models \{ A \} c \{ B \}$ then $\vdash \{ A \} c \{ B \}$

- Assuming that we can compute $\text{wp}(c, B)$ with the following properties:

- wp is a **precondition** (according to the Hoare rules)

$$\vdash \{ \text{wp}(c, B) \} c \{ B \}$$

- wp is (*truly*) **the weakest** precondition

$$\text{If } \models \{ A \} c \{ B \} \text{ then } \models A \Rightarrow \text{wp}(c, B)$$

$$\frac{\vdash A \Rightarrow \text{wp}(c, B) \quad \vdash \{ \text{wp}(c, B) \} c \{ B \}}{\vdash \{ A \} c \{ B \}}$$

- We also need that whenever $\models A$ then $\vdash A$!

Indian Artists



- Despite having physically appeared in only about ten movies, this Indian singer received the *Bharat Ratna* (India's highest civilian honor) and held a controversial Guinness Book of World Records entry for “most recordings” for a time. At one point the Pakistani prime minister said the he would “gladly exchange [her] for Kashmir”. She is the sister of Asha Bhosle and specializes in “playback” or “voiceover” movie music.

Geography

- This “lower” country is famous for having the tallest citizens in the world (on average), housing the UN's International Court of Justice, hosting Europe's busiest seaport, being the first country to legalize same-sex marriage (in 2001), and producing artists such as Rembrandt van Rijn, Johannes Vermeer and Vincent van Gogh.



Simplifying and Correcting Writing




- “In order to X , we do Y ”
 - “To X we do Y ”
- “By induction on the hypothesis”
 - “By the induction hypothesis”
- “Choose X at random”
 - “Let X be arbitrary”
- “For the next step in the proof to proceed, set the value of x to be 2.”
 - “Let x be 2.”

Music Theory

- These are used as a foundation of harmony in Western music, typically to establish a tonality (the key of a song). The popular I-V-vi-IV is used in Taylor Swift's Anti-Hero, Justin Bieber's Ghost, Luis Fonsi's Despacito, Lana Del Rey's Love, Adele's Hello, and Flo Rida's Whistle, among myriad others.



Axiomatic Semantics: Preconditions



Weakest Preconditions

- Define $wp(c, B)$ inductively on c , following the Hoare rules:

- $$wp(c_1; c_2, B) = wp(c_1, wp(c_2, B))$$

$\{A\} c_1 \{C\}$	$\{C\} c_2 \{B\}$
$\{A\} c_1; c_2 \{B\}$	

- $$wp(x := e, B) = [e/x]B$$

$\{ [e/x]B \} x := E \{B\}$

$\{A_1\} c_1 \{B\}$	$\{A_2\} c_2 \{B\}$
$\{ E \Rightarrow A_1 \wedge \neg E \Rightarrow A_2 \} \text{ if } E \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2 \{B\}$	

- $$wp(\text{if } E \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2, B) = E \Rightarrow wp(c_1, B) \wedge \neg E \Rightarrow wp(c_2, B)$$

Weakest Preconditions for Loops

- We start from the *unwinding* equivalence
$$\text{while } b \text{ do } c = \text{if } b \text{ then } c; \text{ while } b \text{ do } c \text{ else skip}$$
- Let $w = \text{while } b \text{ do } c$ and $W = \text{wp}(w, B)$
- We have that
$$W = b \Rightarrow \text{wp}(c, W) \quad \wedge \quad \neg b \Rightarrow B$$
- But this is a **recursive equation**!
 - Mathematicians solve these using domain theory
- But we need a domain for assertions
 - This will give us a way to define “weakest”

A Partial Order for Assertions

- Which assertion contains the least information?
 - “true” : it does not say anything about the state
- What is an appropriate information ordering ?
$$A \sqsubseteq A' \quad \text{iff} \quad \models A' \Rightarrow A$$
- Is this partial order complete?
 - Take a chain $A_1 \sqsubseteq A_2 \sqsubseteq \dots$
 - Let $\bigwedge A_i$ be the infinite conjunction of A_i
$$\sigma \models \bigwedge A_i \quad \text{iff for all } i \text{ we have that } \sigma \models A_i$$
 - I assert that $\bigwedge A_i$ is the least upper bound
- Can $\bigwedge A_i$ be expressed finitely in our language of assertions?
 - In many cases: yes (see Winskel), we'll assume yes for now

Weakest Precondition for WHILE

- Use the fixed-point theorem

$$F(A) = b \Rightarrow wp(c, A) \wedge \neg b \Rightarrow B$$

- (Where did this come from? Two slides back!)
- I assert that F is both monotonic and continuous

- The least-fixed point (= the weakest fixed point) is

$$wp(w, B) = \bigwedge F^i(\text{true})$$


- *(Math aside: that we are not working on a flat domain, such as numbers plus a minimal element.)*

Weakest Preconditions (Cont.)

- Define a family of wp's
 - $\text{wp}_k(\text{while } e \text{ do } c, B)$ = weakest precondition on which the loop terminates in B if it terminates in k or fewer iterations
- $\text{wp}_0 = \neg E \Rightarrow B$
- $\text{wp}_1 = E \Rightarrow \text{wp}(c, \text{wp}_0) \wedge \neg E \Rightarrow B$
- ...
- $\text{wp}(\text{while } e \text{ do } c, B) = \bigwedge_{k \geq 0} \text{wp}_k = \text{lub } \{\text{wp}_k \mid k \geq 0\}$
- See Necula document on the web page for the proof of completeness with weakest preconditions
- Weakest preconditions are
 - Impossible to compute (in general)
 - Can we find something easier to compute yet sufficient?

Not Quite Weakest Preconditions

- Recall what we are trying to do:



- Construct a verification condition: $\text{VC}(c, B)$
 - Our loops will be annotated with loop invariants!
 - VC is guaranteed to be stronger than WP
 - But still weaker than A : $A \Rightarrow \text{VC}(c, B) \Rightarrow \text{WP}(c, B)$

Groundwork

- Factor out the hard work
 - Loop invariants
 - Function specifications (pre- and post-conditions)
- Assume programs are annotated with such specs
 - Good software engineering practice anyway
 - Requiring annotations = Kiss of Death?
- New form of while that includes a loop invariant:
$$\text{while}_{\text{Inv}} b \text{ do } c$$
 - Invariant formula Inv must hold every time before b is evaluated
- A process for computing $\text{VC}(\text{annotated_command}, \text{post_condition})$ is called VCGen

Verification Condition Generation

- Mostly follows the definition of the wp function:

$$\text{VC}(\text{skip}, B) = B$$

$$\text{VC}(c_1; c_2, B) = \text{VC}(c_1, \text{VC}(c_2, B))$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{VC}(\text{if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2, B) = \\ b \Rightarrow \text{VC}(c_1, B) \wedge \neg b \Rightarrow \text{VC}(c_2, B) \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{VC}(x := e, B) = [e/x] B$$

$$\text{VC}(\text{let } x = e \text{ in } c, B) = [e/x] \text{VC}(c, B)$$

$$\text{VC}(\text{while}_{\text{Inv}} b \text{ do } c, B) = ?$$

VCGen for WHILE

$$\text{VC}(\text{while}_{\text{Inv}} e \text{ do } c, B) =$$
$$\underbrace{\text{Inv}}_{\text{Inv holds on entry}} \wedge (\forall x_1 \dots x_n. \text{Inv} \Rightarrow \underbrace{(e \Rightarrow \text{VC}(c, \text{Inv}))}_{\text{Inv is preserved in an arbitrary iteration}} \wedge \underbrace{\neg e \Rightarrow B}_{\text{B holds when the loop terminates in an arbitrary iteration}})$$


- Inv is the loop invariant (provided externally)
- x_1, \dots, x_n are all the variables modified in c
- The \forall is similar to the \forall in mathematical induction:

$$P(0) \wedge \forall n \in \mathbb{N}. P(n) \Rightarrow P(n+1)$$

Example VCGen Problem

- Let's compute the VC of this program with respect to post-condition $x \neq 0$

```
x = 0;  
y = 2;  
while $x+y=2$  y > 0 do  
  y := y - 1;  
  x := x + 1
```



First, what do we expect? **What precondition do we need** to ensure $x \neq 0$ after this?

Example of VC

- By the sequencing rule, first we do the while loop (call it **w**):

while _{$x+y=2$} $y > 0$ do
 $y := y - 1$;
 $x := x + 1$

Preserve loop
invariant

Ensure post on
exit

- $\text{VCGen}(\mathbf{w}, x \neq 0) = x+y=2 \wedge$
 $\forall x, y. x+y=2 \Rightarrow (y>0 \Rightarrow \text{VC}(c, x+y=2) \wedge y \leq 0 \Rightarrow x \neq 0)$
- $\text{VCGen}(y:=y-1 ; x:=x+1, x+y=2) =$
 $(x+1) + (y-1) = 2$
- w** Result: $x+y=2 \wedge$
 $\forall x, y. x+y=2 \Rightarrow (y>0 \Rightarrow (x+1)+(y-1)=2 \wedge y \leq 0 \Rightarrow x \neq 0)$

Example of VC (2)

- $VC(\textcolor{violet}{w}, x \neq 0) = x+y=2 \wedge$
 $\forall x,y. x+y=2 \Rightarrow$
 $(y>0 \Rightarrow \textcolor{red}{(x+1)}+\textcolor{red}{(y-1)}=2 \wedge y \leq 0 \Rightarrow \textcolor{violet}{x} \neq 0)$
- $VC(x := 0; y := 2; \textcolor{violet}{w}, x \neq 0) = 0+2=2 \wedge$
 $\forall x,y. x+y=2 \Rightarrow$
 $(y>0 \Rightarrow \textcolor{red}{(x+1)}+\textcolor{red}{(y-1)}=2 \wedge y \leq 0 \Rightarrow \textcolor{violet}{x} \neq 0)$
- So now we ask an automated theorem prover to prove it.

Thoreau, Thoreau, Thoreau

```
$ ./Simplify
> (AND (EQ (+ 0 2) 2)
      (FORALL ( x y ) (IMPLIES (EQ (+ x y) 2)
                                (AND (IMPLIES (> y 0)
                                           (EQ (+ (+ x 1) (- y 1)) 2))
                                      (IMPLIES (<= y 0) (NEQ x 0))))))
```

1: Valid.

- Huzzah!
- Simplify is a non-trivial five megabytes
- The Z3 theorem prover is huge

Can We Mess Up VCGen?

- The invariant is from the user (= the **adversary**, the **untrusted** code base)
- Let's use a loop invariant that is too weak, like "true".
- $VC = \text{true} \wedge \forall x, y. \text{true} \Rightarrow (y > 0 \Rightarrow \text{true} \wedge y \leq 0 \Rightarrow x \neq 0)$
- Let's use a loop invariant that is false, like "x ≠ 0".
- $VC = 0 \neq 0 \wedge \forall x, y. x \neq 0 \Rightarrow (y > 0 \Rightarrow x + 1 \neq 0 \wedge y \leq 0 \Rightarrow x \neq 0)$

Emerson, Emerson, Emerson

```
$ ./Simplify  
> (AND TRUE  
  (FORALL ( x y ) (IMPLIES TRUE  
    (AND (IMPLIES (> y 0) TRUE)  
      (IMPLIES (<= y 0) (NEQ x 0))))))
```

Counterexample: context:

```
(AND  
  (EQ x 0)  
  (<= y 0)  
)
```

1: Invalid.

- OK, so we won't be fooled.

Soundness of VCGen

- Simple form

$$\models \{ VC(c, B) \} c \{ B \}$$

- Or equivalently that

$$\models VC(c, B) \Rightarrow wp(c, B)$$

- Proof is by induction on the structure of c
 - Try it!
- Soundness holds for any choice of invariant!
- Next: properties and extensions of VCs

Questions

- Homework for later
- Peer review discussion now