CSE 331
Software Design & Implementation

Dan Grossman

Autumn 2019

Lecture 2 – Reasoning About Code With Logic

Overview

- Next few lectures (including first section): two presentations linked to course calendar on the web:
  - Lecture notes – primary source
  - Powerpoint slides – summary & supplement

  They are complementary and you should understand both of them

- Homework 1 due soon (see calendar)

Reasoning about code

Determine what facts are true as a program executes

- Under what assumptions

Examples:

- If **`x`** starts positive, then **`y`** is **`0`** when the loop finishes
- Contents of the array that **`arr`** refers to are sorted
- Except at one code point, **`x + y == z`**
- For all instances of **`Node n`**,
  `n.next == null` ∨ **`n.next.prev == n`**
- …

- Notation: In logic we often use ∧ for "and" and ∨ for "or". Concise and convenient, but we're not dogmatic about it

Why do this?

- Essential complement to *testing*, which we will also study
  - Testing: Actual results for some actual inputs
  - Logical reasoning: Reason about whole classes of inputs/states at once ("If `x > 0`, …")
    - *Prove* a program correct (or find bugs trying), or (even better) develop program and proof together to get a program that is correct by construction
    - Understand *why* code is correct

- Stating assumptions is the essence of specification
  - "Callers must not pass `null` as an argument"
  - "Method will always return an unaliased object"
  - …

Our approach

- Hoare Logic: a classic approach to logical reasoning about code
  - For now, consider just variables, assignments, if-statements, while-loops
    - So no objects or methods for now

- This lecture: The idea, without loops, in 3 passes
  1. High-level intuition of forward and backward reasoning
  2. Precise definition of logical assertions, preconditions, etc.
  3. Definition of weaker/stronger and weakest-precondition

- Next lecture: Loops

Why?

- Programmers rarely "use Hoare logic" in this much detail
  - For simple snippets of code, it's overkill
  - Gets very complicated with objects and aliasing
  - But can be very useful to develop and reason about loops and data with subtle *invariants*
    - Examples: Homework 0, Homework 2

- Also it's an ideal setting for the right logical foundations
  - How can logic "talk about" program states?
  - How does code execution "change what is true"?
  - What do "weaker" and "stronger" mean?

  This is all essential for *specifying library-interfaces*, which *does* happen All the Time in The Real World® (coming lectures)

Example

Forward reasoning:

- Suppose we initially know (or assume) **`w > 0`**

```
// w > 0
x = 17;
// w > 0  ∧  x == 17
y = 42;
// w > 0  ∧  x == 17 ∧  y == 42
z = w + x + y;
// w > 0 ∧ x == 17 ∧ y == 42 ∧ z > 59
```

…

- Then we know various things after, including **`z > 59`**

Example

Backward reasoning:

- Suppose we want **`z`** to be negative at the end

```
// w + 17 + 42 < 0
x = 17;
// w + x + 42 < 0
y = 42;
// w + x + y < 0
z = w + x + y;
// z < 0
```

- Then we know initially we need to know/assume **`w < -59`**
  - Necessary and sufficient

Forward vs. Backward, Part 1

- Forward reasoning:
  - Determine what follows from initial assumptions
  - Most useful for *maintaining an invariant*

- Backward reasoning
  - Determine sufficient conditions for a certain result
    - If result desired, the assumptions suffice for correctness
    - If result undesired, the assumptions suffice to trigger bug

Forward vs. Backward, Part 2

- Forward reasoning:
  - Simulates the code (for many “inputs” “at once”)
  - Often more intuitive
  - But introduces [many] facts irrelevant to a goal

- Backward reasoning
  - Often more useful: Understand what each part of the code contributes toward the goal
  - “Thinking backwards” takes practice but gives you a powerful new way to reason about programs and to write correct code

Conditionals

```
// initial assumptions
if(…) {
  … // also know test evaluated to true
} else {
  … // also know test evaluated to false
}
// either branch could have executed
```

Two key ideas:

1. The precondition for each branch includes information about the result of the test-expression
2. The overall postcondition is the disjunction (“or”) of the postcondition of the branches

Example (Forward)

Assume initially **`x >= 0`**

```
// x >= 0
z = 0;
// x >= 0 ∧ z == 0
if(x != 0) {
  // x >= 0 ∧ z == 0 ∧ x != 0 (so x > 0)
  z = x;
  // … ∧ z > 0
} else {
  // x >= 0 ∧ z == 0 ∧ !(x!=0) (so x == 0)
  z = x + 1;
  // … ∧ z == 1
}
// ( … ∧ z > 0) ∨ (… ∧ z == 1)  (so z > 0)
```

Our approach

- Hoare Logic, a classic approach to logical reasoning about code
  - [Named after its inventor, Tony Hoare]
  - Considering just variables, assignments, if-statements, while-loops
    - So no objects or methods

- This lecture: The idea, without loops, in 3 passes
  1. High-level intuition of forward and backward reasoning
  2. Precise definition of logical assertions, preconditions, etc.
  3. Definition of weaker/stronger and weakest-precondition

- Next lecture: Loops

Some notation and terminology

- The “assumption” before some code is the precondition
- The “what holds after (given assumption)” is the postcondition

- Instead of writing pre/postconditions after //, write them in {…}
  - This is not Java
  - How Hoare logic has been written “on paper” for 40ish years

```
{ w < -59 }
x = 17;
{ w + x < -42 }
```

  - In pre/postconditions, **=** is equality, not assignment
    - Math’s “**=**”, which for numbers is Java’s **==**

```
{ w > 0  ∧  x = 17 }
y = 42;
{ w > 0  ∧  x = 17 ∧  y = 42 }
```

What an assertion means

- An *assertion* (including pre/postconditions) is a logical formula that can refer to program state (e.g., contents of variables)

- A *program state* is something that "given" a variable can "tell you" its contents
  - Or any expression that has no *side-effects*
  - (informally, this is just the current values of all variables)

- An assertion *holds* for a program state, if evaluating using the program state produces *true*
  - Evaluating a program variable produces its contents in the state
  - Can think of an assertion as representing the *set* of (exactly the) states for which it holds

A Hoare Triple

- A Hoare triple is two assertions and one piece of code:

  `{P} S {Q}`

  - *P* the precondition
  - *S* the code (statement)
  - *Q* the postcondition

- A Hoare triple **`{P} S {Q}`** is (by definition) valid if:
  - For all states for which *P* holds, executing *S* always produces a state for which *Q* holds
  - Less formally: If *P* is true before *S*, then *Q* must be true after
  - Else the Hoare triple is invalid

Examples

Valid or invalid?

- (Assume all variables are integers without overflow)

- `{x != 0} y = x*x; {y > 0}` valid
- `{z != 1} y = z*z; {y != z}` invalid
- `{x >= 0} y = 2*x; {y > x}` invalid
- `{true} (if(x > 7) {y=4;} else {y=3;}) {y < 5}` valid
- `{true} (x = y; z = x;) {y=z}` valid
- `{x=7 ∧ y=5}`
  `(tmp=x; x=tmp; y=x;)`
  `{y=7 ∧ x=5}` invalid

Aside: assert *statement* in Java

- An Java **`assert`** is a statement with a Java expression, e.g.,

```
assert x > 0 && y < x;
```

- Similar to our assertions
  - Evaluate using a program state to get **`true`** or **`false`**
  - Uses Java syntax

- In Java, this is a run-time thing: Run the code and raise an exception if assertion is violated
  - Unless assertion-checking is disabled
  - Later course topic – but really useful to detect bugs early

- This week: we are reasoning about the code, not running it on some input

The general rules

- So far: Decided if a Hoare triple was valid by using our understanding of programming constructs

- Now: For each kind of construct there is a general rule
  - A rule for assignment statements
  - A rule for two statements in sequence
  - A rule for conditionals
  - [next lecture:] A rule for loops
  - …

Basic rule: Assignment

`{P} x = e; {Q}`

- Let **`Q'`** be the same as **`Q`** except replace every **`x`** with **`e`**
- Triple is valid if: For all program states, if **`P`** holds, then **`Q'`** holds (i.e., if **`P`** guarantees that **`Q'`** is true, then execution of **`x=e;`** will guarantee that **`Q`** is true)

- Example: **`{z > 34} y=z+1; {y > 1}`**
  - **`Q' is {z+1 > 1}`**

Combining rule: Sequence

`{P} S1;S2 {Q}`

- Triple is valid if and only if there is an assertion **`R`** such that
  - **`{P}S1{R}`** is valid, and
  - **`{R}S2{Q}`** is valid

- Example: **`{z >= 1} y=z+1; w=y*y; {w > y}`** (integers)
  - Let **`R`** be **`{y > 1}`** (this particular **`R`** picked because "it works")
  - Show **`{z >= 1} y=z+1; {y > 1}`**
    - Use rule for assignments: **`z >= 1`** implies **`z+1 > 1`**
  - Show **`{y > 1} w=y*y; {w > y}`**
    - Use rule for assignments: **`y > 1`** implies **`y*y > y`**

Combining rule: Conditional

`{P} if(b) S1 else S2 {Q}`

- Triple is valid if and only if there are assertions **`Q1,Q2`** such that
  - **`{P ∧ b}S1{Q1}`** is valid, and
  - **`{P ∧ !b}S2{Q2}`** is valid, and
  - **`Q1 ∨ Q2`** implies **`Q`**

- Example: **`{true} (if(x > 7) y=x; else y=20;) {y > 5}`**
  - Let **`Q1`** be **`{y > 7}`** (other choices work too)
  - Let **`Q2`** be **`{y = 20}`** (other choices work too)
  - Use assignment rule to show **`{true ∧ x > 7}y=x;{y>7}`**
  - Use assignment rule to show **`{true ∧ x <= 7}y=20;{y=20}`**
  - Indicate **`y>7 ∨ y=20`** implies **`y>5`**

Our approach

- Hoare Logic, a classic approach to logical reasoning about code
  - Considering just variables, assignments, if-statements, while-loops
    - So no objects or methods

- This lecture: The idea, without loops, in 3 passes
  1. High-level intuition of forward and backward reasoning
  2. Precise definition of logical assertions, preconditions, etc.
  3. Definition of weaker/stronger and weakest-precondition

- Next lecture: Loops

Weaker vs. Stronger

If P1 implies P2 (written P1 => P2), then:

- P1 is stronger than P2
- P2 is weaker than P1



- Whenever P1 holds, P2 also holds
- So it is more (or at least as) "difficult" to satisfy P1
  - The program states where P1 holds are a subset of the program states where P2 holds
- So P1 puts more constraints on program states
- So it's a stronger set of obligations/requirements

Examples

- **`x = 17`** is stronger than **`x > 0`**
- **`x is prime`** is neither stronger nor weaker than **`x is odd`**
- **`x is prime and x > 2`** is stronger than
  `x is odd and x > 2`
- …

Why this matters to us



- Suppose:
  - **`{P}S{Q}`**, and
  - **`P`** is weaker than some **`P1`**, and
  - **`Q`** is stronger than some **`Q1`**

- Then: **`{P1}S{Q}`** and **`{P}S{Q1}`** and **`{P1}S{Q1}`**

- Example:
  - **`P`** is **`x >= 0`**
  - **`P1`** is **`x > 0`**
  - **`S`** is **`y = x+1`**
  - **`Q`** is **`y > 0`**
  - **`Q1`** is **`y >= 0`**

So…

- For backward reasoning, if we want **`{P}S{Q}`**, we could instead:
  - Show **`{P1}S{Q}`**, and
  - Show **`P => P1`**

- Better, we could just show **`{P2}S{Q}`** where **`P2`** is the weakest precondition of **`Q`** for **`S`**
  - Weakest means the most lenient assumptions such that **`Q`** will hold after executing **`S`**
  - Any precondition **`P`** such that **`{P}S{Q}`** is valid will be stronger than **`P2`**, i.e., **`P => P2`**

- Amazing (?): Without loops/methods, for any **`S`** and **`Q`**, there exists a unique weakest precondition, written wp(**`S`**,**`Q`**)
  - Like our general rules with backward reasoning

Weakest preconditions

- wp(**`x = e;`**, **`Q`**) is **`Q`** with each **`x`** replaced by **`e`**
  - Example: wp(**`x = y*y;`**, **`x > 4`**) = **`y*y > 4`**, i.e., **`|y| > 2`**

- wp(**`S1;S2`**, **`Q`**) is wp(**`S1`**,wp(**`S2`**,**`Q`**))
  - i.e., let **`R`** be wp(**`S2`**,**`Q`**) and overall wp is wp(**`S1`**,**`R`**)
  - Example: wp(**`(y=x+1; z=y+1;)`**, **`z > 2`**) =
    `(x + 1)+1 > 2`, i.e., **`x > 0`**

- wp(**`if b S1 else S2`**, **`Q`**) is this logic formula:

  `(b` ∧ wp(**`S1,Q`**)**`)`** ∨ **`(!b`** ∧ wp(**`S2,Q`**)**`)`**

  - (In any state, b will evaluate to either true or false…)
  - (You can sometimes then simplify the result)

Simple examples

- If **S** is **`x = y*y`** and **Q** is **`x > 4`**,
  then wp(**S**,**Q**) is **`y*y > 4`**, i.e., **`|y| > 2`**

- If **S** is **`y = x + 1; z = y – 3;`** and **Q** is **`z = 10`**,
  then wp(**S**,**Q**) …
  = wp(**`y = x + 1; z = y – 3;`**, **`z = 10`**)
  = wp(**`y = x + 1;`**, wp(**`z = y – 3;`**, **`z = 10`**))
  = wp(**`y = x + 1;`**, **`y-3 = 10`**)
  = wp(**`y = x + 1;`**, **`y = 13`**)
  = **`x+1 = 13`**
  = **`x = 12`**

Bigger example

```
S is if (x < 5) {
       x = x*x;
     } else {
       x = x+1;
     }
Q is x >= 9
```

wp(**S**, **x >= 9**)

= (**x < 5** ∧ wp(**x = x*x;**, **x >= 9**))

∨ (**x >= 5** ∧ wp(**x = x+1;**, **x >= 9**))

= (**x < 5 ∧ x*x >= 9**)

∨ (**x >= 5 ∧ x+1 >= 9**)

= (**x <= -3**) ∨ (**x >= 3 ∧ x < 5**)

∨ (**x >= 8**)



If-statements review

Forward reasoning

{P}
if B
  {P ∧ B}
  S1
  {Q1}
else
  {P ∧ !B}
  S2
  {Q2}
{Q1 ∨ Q2}

Backward reasoning

{ (B ∧ wp(S1, Q)) ∨
  (!B ∧ wp(S2, Q)) }
if B
  {wp(S1, Q)}
  S1
  {Q}
else
  {wp(S2, Q)}
  S2
  {Q}
{Q}

“Correct”

- If wp(**`S`**,**`Q`**) is **`true`**, then executing **`S`** will always produce a state where **`Q`** holds
  - **`true`** holds for every program state

One more issue

- With forward reasoning, there is a problem with assignment:
  - Changing a variable can affect other assumptions

- Example:

```
{true}
w=x+y;
{w = x + y;}
x=4;
{w = x + y ∧ x = 4}
y=3;
{w = x + y ∧ x = 4 ∧ y = 3}
```

But clearly we do not know **w=7**!

The fix

- When you assign to a variable, you need to replace all other uses of the variable in the post-condition with a different variable
  - So you refer to the "old contents"
    - But only do this if you actually use the "old contents" from that variable later in the proof – omit otherwise
- Corrected example:

```
{true}
w=x+y;
{w = x + y;}
x=4;
{w = x1 + y ∧ x = 4}
y=3;
{w = x1 + y1 ∧ x = 4 ∧ y = 3}
```

Useful example: swap

- Swap contents
  - Give a name to initial contents so we can refer to them in the post-condition
  - Just in the formulas: these “names” are not in the program
  - Use these extra variables to avoid “forgetting” “connections”

```
{x = x_pre ∧ y = y_pre}
tmp = x;
{x = x_pre ∧ y = y_pre ∧ tmp=x}
x = y;
{x = y ∧ y = y_pre ∧ tmp=x_pre}
y = tmp;
{x = y_pre ∧ y = tmp ∧ tmp=x_pre}
```