

COMP 4161
NICTA Advanced Course

Advanced Topics in Software Verification

Gerwin Klein
Formal Methods

$\lambda \rightarrow$ and HOL

Slide 1

MORE COMPLEX EXAMPLE

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\Gamma \vdash f :: \alpha \Rightarrow (\alpha \Rightarrow \beta)}{\Gamma \vdash f x :: \alpha \Rightarrow \beta} \quad \frac{\Gamma \vdash x :: \alpha}{\Gamma \vdash x :: \alpha}}{\Gamma \vdash f x x :: \beta}}{\frac{[f \leftarrow \alpha \Rightarrow \alpha \Rightarrow \beta] \vdash \lambda x. f x x :: \alpha \Rightarrow \beta}{\[] \vdash \lambda f x. f x x :: (\alpha \Rightarrow \alpha \Rightarrow \beta) \Rightarrow \alpha \Rightarrow \beta}}$$

$$\Gamma = [f \leftarrow \alpha \Rightarrow \alpha \Rightarrow \beta, x \leftarrow \alpha]$$

Slide 2

MORE GENERAL TYPES

A term can have more than one type.

Example: $\[] \vdash \lambda x. x :: \text{bool} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$
 $\[] \vdash \lambda x. x :: \alpha \Rightarrow \alpha$

Some types are more general than others:

$\tau \lesssim \sigma$ if there is a substitution S such that $\tau = S(\sigma)$

Examples:

$\text{int} \Rightarrow \text{bool} \lesssim \alpha \Rightarrow \beta \lesssim \beta \Rightarrow \alpha \not\lesssim \alpha \Rightarrow \alpha$

Slide 3

MOST GENERAL TYPES

Fact: each type correct term has a most general type

Formally:

$$\Gamma \vdash t :: \tau \implies \exists \sigma. \Gamma \vdash t :: \sigma \wedge (\forall \sigma'. \Gamma \vdash t :: \sigma' \implies \sigma' \lesssim \sigma)$$

It can be found by executing the typing rules backwards.

→ **type checking:** checking if $\Gamma \vdash t :: \tau$ for given Γ and τ

→ **type inference:** computing Γ and τ such that $\Gamma \vdash t :: \tau$

Type checking and type inference on $\lambda \rightarrow$ are decidable.

Slide 4

WHAT ABOUT β REDUCTION?



Definition of β reduction stays the same.

Fact: Well typed terms stay well typed during β reduction

Formally: $\Gamma \vdash s :: \tau \wedge s \rightarrow_{\beta} t \implies \Gamma \vdash t :: \tau$

This property is called **subject reduction**

Slide 5

WHAT ABOUT TERMINATION?



β reduction in λ^{\neg} always terminates.



(Alan Turing, 1942)

→ $=_{\beta}$ is decidable

To decide if $s =_{\beta} t$, reduce s and t to normal form (always exists, because \rightarrow_{β} terminates), and compare result.

→ $=_{\alpha\beta\eta}$ is decidable

This is why Isabelle can automatically reduce each term to $\beta\eta$ normal form.

Slide 6

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR EXPRESSIVENESS?



Not all computable functions can be expressed in λ^{\neg} !

How can typed functional languages then be Turing complete?

Fact:

Each computable function can be encoded as closed, type correct λ^{\neg} term using $Y :: (\tau \Rightarrow \tau) \Rightarrow \tau$ with $Y t \rightarrow_{\beta} t (Y t)$ as only constant.

→ Y is called fix point operator

→ used for recursion

Slide 7

TYPES AND TERMS IN ISABELLE



Types: $\tau ::= \mathbf{b} \mid 'v \mid 'v :: C \mid \tau \Rightarrow \tau \mid (\tau, \dots, \tau) K$
 $\mathbf{b} \in \{\text{bool}, \text{int}, \dots\}$ base types
 $v \in \{\alpha, \beta, \dots\}$ type variables
 $K \in \{\text{set}, \text{list}, \dots\}$ type constructors
 $C \in \{\text{order}, \text{linord}, \dots\}$ type classes

Terms: $t ::= v \mid c \mid ?v \mid (tt) \mid (\lambda x. t)$
 $v, x \in V, c \in C, V, C$ sets of names

→ **type constructors:** construct a new type out of a parameter type.
Example: `int list`

→ **type classes:** restrict type variables to a class defined by axioms.
Example: `$\alpha :: \text{order}$`

→ **schematic variables:** variables that can be instantiated.

Slide 8

TYPE CLASSES



- similar to Haskell's type classes, but with semantic properties
 - axclass** order < ord
 - order_refl: " $x \leq x$ "
 - order_trans: " $[x \leq y; y \leq z] \implies x \leq z$ "
 - ...
- theorems can be proved in the abstract
 - lemma** order_less_trans: " $\wedge x :: a :: order. [x < y; y < z] \implies x < z$ "
- can be used for subtyping
 - axclass** linorder < order
 - linorder_linear: " $x \leq y \vee y \leq x$ "
- can be instantiated
 - instance** nat :: "{order, linorder}" by ...

Slide 9

SCHEMATIC VARIABLES



$$\frac{X \quad Y}{X \wedge Y}$$

- X and Y must be **instantiated** to apply the rule
 - But:** **lemma** " $x + 0 = 0 + x$ "
- x is free
- convention: lemma must be true for all x
- **during the proof**, x must **not** be instantiated

Solution:

Isabelle has **free** (x), **bound** (x), and **schematic** ($?X$) variables.

Only schematic variables can be instantiated.

Free converted into schematic after proof is finished.

Slide 10

HIGHER ORDER UNIFICATION



Unification:

Find substitution σ on variables for terms s, t such that $\sigma(s) = \sigma(t)$

In Isabelle:

Find substitution σ on schematic variables such that $\sigma(s) =_{\alpha\beta\eta} \sigma(t)$

Examples:

$$\begin{aligned} ?X \wedge ?Y &=_{\alpha\beta\eta} x \wedge x & [?X \leftarrow x, ?Y \leftarrow x] \\ ?P \ x &=_{\alpha\beta\eta} x \wedge x & [?P \leftarrow \lambda x. x \wedge x] \\ P \ (?f \ x) &=_{\alpha\beta\eta} ?Y \ x & [?f \leftarrow \lambda x. x, ?Y \leftarrow P] \end{aligned}$$

Higher Order: schematic variables can be functions.

Slide 11

HIGHER ORDER UNIFICATION



- Unification modulo α, β (Higher Order Unification) is semi-decidable
- Unification modulo α, β, η is undecidable
- Higher Order Unification has possibly infinitely many solutions

But:

- Most cases are well-behaved
- Important fragments (like Higher Order Patterns) are decidable

Higher Order Pattern:

- is a term in β normal form where
- each occurrence of a schematic variable is of the form $?f \ t_1 \ \dots \ t_n$
- and the $t_1 \ \dots \ t_n$ are η -convertible into n distinct bound variables

Slide 12

WE HAVE LEARNED SO FAR...



- Simply typed lambda calculus: λ^-
- Typing rules for λ^- , type variables, type contexts
- β -reduction in λ^- satisfies subject reduction
- β -reduction in λ^- always terminates
- Types and terms in Isabelle

Slide 13



PREVIEW: PROOFS IN ISABELLE

Slide 14

PROOFS IN ISABELLE



General schema:

```
lemma name: "<goal>"
apply <method>
apply <method>
...
done
```

- Sequential application of methods until all **subgoals** are solved.

Slide 15

THE PROOF STATE



1. $\bigwedge x_1 \dots x_p. [A_1; \dots; A_n] \Rightarrow B$
2. $\bigwedge y_1 \dots y_q. [C_1; \dots; C_m] \Rightarrow D$

$x_1 \dots x_p$ Parameters
 $A_1 \dots A_n$ Local assumptions
 B Actual (sub)goal

Slide 16

Syntax:

```
theory MyTh = ImpTh1 + ... + ImpThn :
(declarations, definitions, theorems, proofs, ...)*
end
```

- *MyTh*: name of theory. Must live in file *MyTh.thy*
- *ImpTh_i*: name of *imported* theories. Import transitive.

Unless you need something special:

```
theory MyTh = Main:
```

Slide 17

$$\frac{A \quad B}{A \wedge B} \text{ conjI} \qquad \frac{A \wedge B \quad [A; B] \Rightarrow C}{C} \text{ conjE}$$

$$\frac{A}{A \vee B} \quad \frac{B}{A \vee B} \text{ disjI1/2} \qquad \frac{A \vee B \quad A \Rightarrow C \quad B \Rightarrow C}{C} \text{ disjE}$$

$$\frac{A \Rightarrow B}{A \rightarrow B} \text{ impl} \qquad \frac{A \rightarrow B \quad A \quad B \Rightarrow C}{C} \text{ impE}$$

For each connective (\wedge, \vee , etc):
introduction and elimination rules

Slide 18

apply assumption

proves

$$1. [B_1; \dots; B_m] \Rightarrow C$$

by unifying C with one of the B_i

There may be more than one matching B_i and multiple unifiers.

Backtracking!

Explicit backtracking command: **back**

Slide 19

Intro rules decompose formulae to the right of \Rightarrow .

apply (rule <intro-rule>)

Intro rule $[A_1; \dots; A_n] \Rightarrow A$ means

- To prove A it suffices to show $A_1 \dots A_n$

Applying rule $[A_1; \dots; A_n] \Rightarrow A$ to subgoal C :

- unify A and C
- replace C with n new subgoals $A_1 \dots A_n$

Slide 20

Elim rules decompose formulae on the left of \Rightarrow .

apply (erule <elim-rule>)

Elim rule $[A_1; \dots; A_n] \Rightarrow A$ means

→ If I know A_1 and want to prove A it suffices to show $A_2 \dots A_n$

Applying rule $[A_1; \dots; A_n] \Rightarrow A$ to subgoal C :

Like **rule** but also

→ unifies first premise of rule with an assumption

→ eliminates that assumption

Slide 21

DEMO

Slide 22