COMP4161: Advanced Topics in Software Verification

HOL

Gerwin Klein, June Andronick, Ramana Kumar

S2/2016

Last time...

- ➜ natural deduction rules for $\wedge$, $\vee$, $\longrightarrow$, $\neg$, iff...
- ➜ proof by assumption, by intro rule, elim rule
- ➜ safe and unsafe rules

- ➜ indent your proofs! (one space per subgoal)
- ➜ prefer implicit backtracking (chaining) or *rule_tac*, instead of *back*
- ➜ *prefer* and *defer*
- ➜ *oops* and *sorry*

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

Quantifiers

Scope

- Scope of parameters: whole subgoal
- Scope of $\forall, \exists, \ldots$: ends with ; or $\Longrightarrow$

Example:

Scope

- Scope of parameters: whole subgoal
- Scope of $\forall, \exists, \ldots$: ends with ; or $\Longrightarrow$

Example:

$$\bigwedge x\ y.\ [\![\ \forall y.\ P\ y \longrightarrow Q\ z\ y;\ \ Q\ x\ y\ ]\!] \Longrightarrow \exists x.\ Q\ x\ y$$

means

Scope

- Scope of parameters: whole subgoal
- Scope of $\forall, \exists, \ldots$: ends with ; or $\Longrightarrow$

Example:

$$\bigwedge x\ y.\ [\![\ \forall y.\ P\ y \longrightarrow Q\ z\ y;\quad Q\ x\ y\ ]\!]\ \Longrightarrow\ \exists x.\ Q\ x\ y$$

means

$$\bigwedge x\ y.\ [\![\ (\forall y_1.\ P\ y_1 \longrightarrow Q\ z\ y_1);\quad Q\ x\ y\ ]\!]\ \Longrightarrow\ (\exists x_1.\ Q\ x_1\ y)$$

Natural deduction for quantifiers

$$\frac{}{\forall x.\ P\ x}\ \text{allI} \qquad \frac{\forall x.\ P\ x}{R}\ \text{allE}$$

$$\frac{}{\exists x.\ P\ x}\ \text{exI} \qquad \frac{\exists x.\ P\ x}{R}\ \text{exE}$$

Natural deduction for quantifiers

$$\frac{\bigwedge x.\ P\ x}{\forall x.\ P\ x}\ \text{allI} \qquad \frac{\forall x.\ P\ x}{R}\ \text{allE}$$

$$\frac{}{\exists x.\ P\ x}\ \text{exI} \qquad \frac{\exists x.\ P\ x}{R}\ \text{exE}$$

Natural deduction for quantifiers

$$\frac{\bigwedge x.\ P\ x}{\forall x.\ P\ x}\ \text{allI} \qquad \frac{\forall x.\ P\ x \quad P\ ?x \Longrightarrow R}{R}\ \text{allE}$$

$$\frac{}{\exists x.\ P\ x}\ \text{exI} \qquad \frac{\exists x.\ P\ x}{R}\ \text{exE}$$

Natural deduction for quantifiers

$$\frac{\bigwedge x.\ P\ x}{\forall x.\ P\ x}\ \text{allI} \qquad \frac{\forall x.\ P\ x \quad P\ ?x \Longrightarrow R}{R}\ \text{allE}$$

$$\frac{P\ ?x}{\exists x.\ P\ x}\ \text{exI} \qquad \frac{\exists x.\ P\ x}{R}\ \text{exE}$$

Natural deduction for quantifiers

$$\frac{\bigwedge x.\ P\ x}{\forall x.\ P\ x}\ \text{allI} \qquad \frac{\forall x.\ P\ x \quad P\ ?x \Longrightarrow R}{R}\ \text{allE}$$

$$\frac{P\ ?x}{\exists x.\ P\ x}\ \text{exI} \qquad \frac{\exists x.\ P\ x \quad \bigwedge x.\ P\ x \Longrightarrow R}{R}\ \text{exE}$$

Natural deduction for quantifiers

$$\frac{\bigwedge x.\ P\ x}{\forall x.\ P\ x}\ \text{allI} \qquad \frac{\forall x.\ P\ x \quad P\ ?x \Longrightarrow R}{R}\ \text{allE}$$

$$\frac{P\ ?x}{\exists x.\ P\ x}\ \text{exI} \qquad \frac{\exists x.\ P\ x \quad \bigwedge x.\ P\ x \Longrightarrow R}{R}\ \text{exE}$$

- **allI** and **exE** introduce new parameters ($\bigwedge x$).
- **allE** and **exI** introduce new unknowns ($?x$).

Instantiating Rules

apply (rule_tac x = "*term*" in *rule*)

Like **rule**, but ?*x* in *rule* is instantiated by *term* before application.

Similar: **erule_tac**

! *x* **is in** *rule***, not in goal** **!**

Two Successful Proofs

1. $\forall x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

Two Successful Proofs

1. $\forall x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

apply (rule allI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

Two Successful Proofs

1. $\forall x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

apply (rule allI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

best practice

apply (rule_tac x = "x" in exI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ x = x$

Two Successful Proofs

1. $\forall x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

apply (rule allI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

best practice

apply (rule_tac x = "x" in exI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ x = x$

apply (rule refl)

Two Successful Proofs

1. $\forall x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

apply (rule allI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

best practice

apply (rule_tac x = "x" in exI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ x = x$

apply (rule refl)

exploration

apply (rule exI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ x = ?y\ x$

Two Successful Proofs

1. $\forall x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

apply (rule allI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

best practice

apply (rule_tac x = "x" in exI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ x = x$

apply (rule refl)

exploration

apply (rule exI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ x = ?y\ x$

apply (rule refl)

$?y \mapsto \lambda u.u$

Two Successful Proofs

1. $\forall x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

apply (rule allI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

best practice

apply (rule_tac x = "x" in exI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ x = x$

apply (rule refl)

simpler & clearer

exploration

apply (rule exI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ x = ?y\ x$

apply (rule refl)

$?y \mapsto \lambda u.u$

shorter & trickier

Two Unsuccessful Proofs

1. $\exists y.\ \forall x.\ x = y$

Two Unsuccessful Proofs

$$1.\ \exists y.\ \forall x.\ x = y$$

apply (rule_tac x = ??? in exI)

Two Unsuccessful Proofs

1. $\exists y.\ \forall x.\ x = y$

apply (rule_tac x = ??? in exI)

apply (rule exI)

1. $\forall x.\ x = ?y$

Two Unsuccessful Proofs

1. $\exists y.\ \forall x.\ x = y$

apply (rule_tac x = ??? in exI)

apply (rule exI)

1. $\forall x.\ x = ?y$

apply (rule allI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ x = ?y$

Two Unsuccessful Proofs

1. $\exists y.\ \forall x.\ x = y$

apply (rule_tac x = ??? in exI)

apply (rule exI)

1. $\forall x.\ x = ?y$

apply (rule allI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ x = ?y$

apply (rule refl)

$?y \mapsto x$ yields $\bigwedge x'.\ x' = x$

Two Unsuccessful Proofs

$$1. \ \exists y.\ \forall x.\ x = y$$

apply (rule_tac x = ??? in exI)

apply (rule exI)

$1.\ \forall x.\ x = ?y$

apply (rule allI)

$1.\ \bigwedge x.\ x = ?y$

apply (rule refl)

$?y \mapsto x$ yields $\bigwedge x'.\ x' = x$

Principle:

$?f\ x_1 \ldots x_n$ **can only be replaced by term** t

if $params(t) \subseteq x_1, \ldots, x_n$

Safe and Unsafe Rules

Safe allI, exE

Unsafe allE, exI

Safe and Unsafe Rules

Safe allI, exE

Unsafe allE, exI

Create parameters first, unknowns later

Demo: Quantifier Proofs

Parameter names

Parameter names are chosen by Isabelle

1. $\forall\, x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

Parameter names

Parameter names are chosen by Isabelle

1. $\forall\, x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

apply (rule allI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

Parameter names

Parameter names are chosen by Isabelle

1. $\forall\, x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

apply (rule allI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

apply (rule_tac x = "x" in exI)

Brittle!

Renaming parameters

1. $\forall x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

apply (rule allI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

Renaming parameters

1. $\forall x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

apply (rule allI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

apply (rename_tac N)

1. $\bigwedge N.\ \exists y.\ N = y$

Renaming parameters

1. $\forall x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

apply (rule allI)

1. $\bigwedge x.\ \exists y.\ x = y$

apply (rename_tac N)

1. $\bigwedge N.\ \exists y.\ N = y$

apply (rule_tac x = "N" in exI)

In general:
(rename_tac $x_1 \ldots x_n$) renames the rightmost (inner) n parameters to $x_1 \ldots x_n$

Forward Proof: frule and drule

apply (frule $<$ *rule* $>$)

Rule: $[\![A_1; \ldots; A_m]\!] \Longrightarrow A$

Subgoal: 1. $[\![B_1; \ldots; B_n]\!] \Longrightarrow C$

Forward Proof: frule and drule

apply (frule $<$ *rule* $>$)

Rule:	$[\![A_1; \ldots; A_m]\!] \Longrightarrow A$
Subgoal:	1. $[\![B_1; \ldots; B_n]\!] \Longrightarrow C$
Substitution:	$\sigma(B_i) \equiv \sigma(A_1)$

Forward Proof: frule and drule

apply (frule < *rule* >)

Rule: $[\![A_1; \ldots; A_m]\!] \Longrightarrow A$

Subgoal: 1. $[\![B_1; \ldots; B_n]\!] \Longrightarrow C$

Substitution: $\sigma(B_i) \equiv \sigma(A_1)$

New subgoals: 1. $\sigma([\![B_1; \ldots; B_n]\!] \Longrightarrow A_2)$

$\vdots$

m-1. $\sigma([\![B_1; \ldots; B_n]\!] \Longrightarrow A_m)$

m. $\sigma([\![B_1; \ldots; B_n; A]\!] \Longrightarrow C)$

Forward Proof: frule and drule

apply (frule $<$ *rule* $>$)

Rule: $[\![A_1;\ldots;A_m]\!] \Longrightarrow A$

Subgoal: 1. $[\![B_1;\ldots;B_n]\!] \Longrightarrow C$

Substitution: $\sigma(B_i) \equiv \sigma(A_1)$

New subgoals: 1. $\sigma([\![B_1;\ldots;B_n]\!] \Longrightarrow A_2)$

$\vdots$

m-1. $\sigma([\![B_1;\ldots;B_n]\!] \Longrightarrow A_m)$

m. $\sigma([\![B_1;\ldots;B_n;A]\!] \Longrightarrow C)$

Like **frule** but also deletes B_i: **apply** (drule $<$ *rule* $>$)

Examples for Forward Rules

$$\frac{P \wedge Q}{P}\ \text{conjunct1} \qquad \frac{P \wedge Q}{Q}\ \text{conjunct2}$$

$$\frac{P \longrightarrow Q \quad P}{Q}\ \text{mp}$$

$$\frac{\forall x.\ P\ x}{P\ ?x}\ \text{spec}$$

Forward Proof: OF

$$r\ [\mathbf{OF}\ r_1 \ldots r_n]$$

Prove assumption 1 *of theorem* r *with theorem* r_1*, and assumption* 2 *with theorem* r_2*, and* ...

Forward Proof: OF

$$r\ [\textbf{OF}\ r_1 \ldots r_n]$$

Prove assumption 1 *of theorem* r *with theorem* r_1*, and assumption* 2 *with theorem* r_2*, and* ...

Rule r	$[\![A_1; \ldots ; A_m]\!] \Longrightarrow A$
Rule r_1	$[\![B_1; \ldots ; B_n]\!] \Longrightarrow B$

Forward Proof: OF

$$r \ [\textbf{OF} \ r_1 \ldots r_n]$$

Prove assumption 1 of theorem r with theorem r_1, and assumption 2 with theorem r_2, and ...

Rule r	$[\![A_1; \ldots; A_m]\!] \Longrightarrow A$
Rule r_1	$[\![B_1; \ldots; B_n]\!] \Longrightarrow B$
Substitution	$\sigma(B) \equiv \sigma(A_1)$

Forward Proof: OF

$$r\ [\mathbf{OF}\ r_1 \ldots r_n]$$

Prove assumption 1 *of theorem* r *with theorem* r_1*, and assumption* 2 *with theorem* r_2*, and* ...

Rule r	$[\![A_1; \ldots; A_m]\!] \Longrightarrow A$
Rule r_1	$[\![B_1; \ldots; B_n]\!] \Longrightarrow B$
Substitution	$\sigma(B) \equiv \sigma(A_1)$
r [OF r_1]	$\sigma([\![B_1; \ldots; B_n; A_2; \ldots; A_m]\!] \Longrightarrow A)$

Forward proofs: THEN

$$r_1 \text{ [THEN } r_2\text{]} \quad \text{means} \quad r_2 \text{ [OF } r_1\text{]}$$

Demo: Forward Proofs

Hilbert's Epsilon Operator

(David Hilbert, 1862-1943)

$\varepsilon\ x.\ Px$ is a value that satisfies P (if such a value exists)

Hilbert's Epsilon Operator

(David Hilbert, 1862-1943)

$\varepsilon\ x.\ Px$ is a value that satisfies P (if such a value exists)

ε also known as **description operator**.
In Isabelle the ε-operator is written SOME $x.\ P\ x$

Hilbert's Epsilon Operator

(David Hilbert, 1862-1943)

$\varepsilon\ x.\ Px$ is a value that satisfies P (if such a value exists)

ε also known as **description operator**.
In Isabelle the ε-operator is written SOME $x.\ P\ x$

$$\frac{P\ ?x}{P\ (\text{SOME}\ x.\ P\ x)}\ \text{someI}$$

More Epsilon

$\mathcal{E}$ implies Axiom of Choice:

$$\forall x.\ \exists y.\ Q\ x\ y \Longrightarrow \exists f.\ \forall x.\ Q\ x\ (f\ x)$$

Existential and universal quantification can be defined with ε.

More Epsilon

$\mathcal{E}$ implies Axiom of Choice:

$$\forall x.\ \exists y.\ Q\ x\ y \Longrightarrow \exists f.\ \forall x.\ Q\ x\ (f\ x)$$

Existential and universal quantification can be defined with ε.

Isabelle also knows the definite description operator **THE** (aka ι):

$$\frac{}{(\text{THE } x.\ x = a) = a}\ \text{the\_eq\_trivial}$$

Some Automation

More Proof Methods:

apply (intro <intro-rules>)	repeatedly applies intro rules
apply (elim <elim-rules>)	repeatedly applies elim rules

Some Automation

More Proof Methods:

apply (intro <intro-rules>)	repeatedly applies intro rules
apply (elim <elim-rules>)	repeatedly applies elim rules
apply clarify	applies all safe rules that do not split the goal

Some Automation

More Proof Methods:

apply (intro <intro-rules>)	repeatedly applies intro rules
apply (elim <elim-rules>)	repeatedly applies elim rules
apply clarify	applies all safe rules that do not split the goal
apply safe	applies all safe rules

Some Automation

More Proof Methods:

apply (intro <intro-rules>)	repeatedly applies intro rules
apply (elim <elim-rules>)	repeatedly applies elim rules
apply clarify	applies all safe rules that do not split the goal
apply safe	applies all safe rules
apply blast	an automatic tableaux prover (works well on predicate logic)

Some Automation

More Proof Methods:

apply (intro <intro-rules>)	repeatedly applies intro rules
apply (elim <elim-rules>)	repeatedly applies elim rules
apply clarify	applies all safe rules that do not split the goal
apply safe	applies all safe rules
apply blast	an automatic tableaux prover (works well on predicate logic)
apply fast	another automatic search tactic

Epsilon and Automation Demo

We have learned so far...

➜ Proof rules for predicate calculus

We have learned so far...

- ➜ Proof rules for predicate calculus
- ➜ Safe and unsafe rules

We have learned so far...

- Proof rules for predicate calculus
- Safe and unsafe rules
- Forward Proof

We have learned so far...

- ➜ Proof rules for predicate calculus
- ➜ Safe and unsafe rules
- ➜ Forward Proof
- ➜ The Epsilon Operator

We have learned so far...

- ➜ Proof rules for predicate calculus
- ➜ Safe and unsafe rules
- ➜ Forward Proof
- ➜ The Epsilon Operator
- ➜ Some automation

Assignment

Assignement 1 is out today!

Reminder: **DO NOT COPY**

Assignment

Assignement 1 is out today!

Reminder: **DO NOT COPY**

- Assignments and exams are take-home. This does NOT mean you can work in groups. Each submission is personal.
- For more info, see Plagiarism Policy