
COMP 4161
NICTA Advanced Course

Advanced Topics in Software Verification

Toby Murray, June Andronick, Gerwin Klein



Last time...

- λ calculus syntax
- free variables, substitution
- β reduction
- α and η conversion
- β reduction is confluent
- λ calculus is expressive (turing complete)
- λ calculus is inconsistent

Content

- Intro & motivation, getting started [1]

- Foundations & Principles
 - Lambda Calculus, natural deduction [1,2]
 - Higher Order Logic [3^a]
 - Term rewriting [4]

- Proof & Specification Techniques
 - Inductively defined sets, rule induction [5]
 - Datatypes, recursion, induction [6, 7]
 - Hoare logic, proofs about programs, C verification [8^b,9]
 - (mid-semester break)
 - Writing Automated Proof Methods [10]
 - Isar, codegen, typeclasses, locales [11^c,12]

^a a1 due; ^b a2 due; ^c a3 due

λ calculus is inconsistent

Can find term R such that $R R =_{\beta} \text{not}(R R)$

There are more terms that do not make sense:

`1 2`, `true false`, `etc.`

Solution: rule out ill-formed terms by using types.
(Church 1940)

Introducing types

Idea: assign a type to each “sensible” λ term.

Examples:

→ for *term* t has type α write $t :: \alpha$

→ if x has type α then $\lambda x. x$ is a function from α to α

Write: $(\lambda x. x) :: \alpha \Rightarrow \alpha$

→ for $s t$ to be sensible:

s must be function

t must be right type for parameter

If $s :: \alpha \Rightarrow \beta$ and $t :: \alpha$ then $(s t) :: \beta$

THAT'S ABOUT IT

NOW FORMALLY AGAIN

Syntax for λ^{\rightarrow}

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

Types: $\tau ::= b \mid \nu \mid \tau \Rightarrow \tau$
 $b \in \{\text{bool}, \text{int}, \dots\}$ base types
 $\nu \in \{\alpha, \beta, \dots\}$ type variables

$$\alpha \Rightarrow \beta \Rightarrow \gamma \quad = \quad \alpha \Rightarrow (\beta \Rightarrow \gamma)$$

Context Γ :

Γ : function from variable and constant names to types.

Term t has type τ in context Γ : $\Gamma \vdash t :: \tau$

Examples

$$\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x. x) :: \alpha \Rightarrow \alpha$$
$$[y \leftarrow \text{int}] \vdash y :: \text{int}$$
$$[z \leftarrow \text{bool}] \vdash (\lambda y. y) z :: \text{bool}$$
$$[] \vdash \lambda f x. f x :: (\alpha \Rightarrow \beta) \Rightarrow \alpha \Rightarrow \beta$$

A term t is **well typed** or **type correct**
if there are Γ and τ such that $\Gamma \vdash t :: \tau$

Type Checking Rules

Variables:
$$\overline{\Gamma \vdash x :: \Gamma(x)}$$

Application:
$$\frac{\Gamma \vdash t_1 :: \tau_2 \Rightarrow \tau \quad \Gamma \vdash t_2 :: \tau_2}{\Gamma \vdash (t_1 t_2) :: \tau}$$

Abstraction:
$$\frac{\Gamma[x \leftarrow \tau_x] \vdash t :: \tau}{\Gamma \vdash (\lambda x. t) :: \tau_x \Rightarrow \tau}$$

Example Type Derivation:

$$\frac{\frac{[x \leftarrow \alpha, y \leftarrow \beta] \vdash x :: \alpha}{[x \leftarrow \alpha] \vdash \lambda y. x :: \beta \Rightarrow \alpha}}{[] \vdash \lambda x y. x :: \alpha \Rightarrow \beta \Rightarrow \alpha}}$$

More complex Example

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

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

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

More general Types

A term can have more than one type.

Example: $\square \vdash \lambda x. x :: \text{bool} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$

$\square \vdash \lambda x. x :: \alpha \Rightarrow \alpha$

Some types are more general than others:

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

Examples:

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

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 λ^{\rightarrow} are decidable.

What about β reduction?

Definition of β reduction stays the same.

Fact: Well typed terms stay well typed during β reduction

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

This property is called **subject reduction**

What about termination?

β reduction in $\lambda \rightarrow$ 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.

What does this mean for Expressiveness?

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

How can typed functional languages then be turing complete?

Fact:

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

- Y is called fix point operator
- used for recursion
- lose decidability (what does $Y (\lambda x. x)$ reduce to?)
- (Isabelle/HOL doesn't have Y ; it supports more restricted forms of recursion)

Types and Terms in Isabelle

Types: $\tau ::= b \mid \nu \mid \nu :: C \mid \tau \Rightarrow \tau \mid (\tau, \dots, \tau) K$

$b \in \{\text{bool}, \text{int}, \dots\}$ base types

$\nu \in \{\alpha, \beta, \dots\}$ type variables

$K \in \{\text{set}, \text{list}, \dots\}$ type constructors

$C \in \{\text{order}, \text{linord}, \dots\}$ type classes

Terms: $t ::= v \mid c \mid ?v \mid (t t) \mid (\lambda x. t)$

$v, x \in V, \quad c \in C, \quad V, C$ 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.

Type Classes

- similar to Haskell's type classes, but with semantic properties

```
class order =
```

```
  assumes order_refl: " $x \leq x$ "
```

```
  assumes order_trans: " $\llbracket x \leq y; y \leq z \rrbracket \implies x \leq z$ "
```

```
  ...
```

- theorems can be proved in the abstract

```
lemma order_less_trans: " $\bigwedge x :: 'a :: order. \llbracket x < y; y < z \rrbracket \implies x < z$ "
```

- can be used for subtyping

```
class linorder = order +
```

```
  assumes linorder_linear: " $x \leq y \vee y \leq x$ "
```

- can be instantiated

```
instance nat :: " $\{order, linorder\}$ " by ...
```

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** (λx), and **schematic** ($?X$) variables.

Only schematic variables can be instantiated.

Free converted into schematic after proof is finished.

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:

$$?X \wedge ?Y \quad =_{\alpha\beta\eta} \quad x \wedge x \quad [?X \leftarrow x, ?Y \leftarrow x]$$

$$?P \ x \quad =_{\alpha\beta\eta} \quad x \wedge x \quad [?P \leftarrow \lambda x. x \wedge x]$$

$$P \ (?f \ x) \quad =_{\alpha\beta\eta} \quad ?Y \ x \quad [?f \leftarrow \lambda x. x, ?Y \leftarrow P]$$

Higher Order: schematic variables can be functions.

Higher Order Unification

- Unification modulo $\alpha\beta$ (Higher Order Unification) is semi-decidable
- Unification modulo $\alpha\beta\eta$ 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

We have learned so far...

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